



FROM time to time you may find it necessary to arrange for Administration, Lunacy and other Bonds in connection with Appointments under the Chancery Court or Bankruptcy Acts.

THE Legal & General Assurance Society Ltd., by reason of its legal constitution, has always cultivated business particular to the profession, and it is, therefore, well equipped by its organisation and experience to deal with these Bonds.

THE Probate Court accept the Society in its corporate capacity as Surety in place of two Personal Sureties.

MAY we submit a quotation for the next Bond you require?

ASSETS - - £13,500,000.

HEAD OFFICES:

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

(ESTABLISHED IN 1857.)

LONDON, MARCH 26, 1921.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

£2 12s.; by Post, £2 14s.; Foreign, £2 16s.

HALF-YEARLY AND QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTIONS IN PROPORTION.

* * The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

GENERAL HEADINGS.

CURRENT TOPICS	409	LORD FINLAY ON LEGAL EDUCATION ...	419
THE NEW PART I OF THE LAW OF		THE LATE LORD MOULTON	419
PROPERTY BILL	412	INNER TO SIR R. LINTHORNE, Q.B. ...	419
THE CITATION OF REPORTS	413	THE AGRICULTURE (AMENDMENT) BILL	420
PSYCHO-ANALYSIS IN THE COURTS	414	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	420
REVIEWS	415	OBITUARY	420
BOOKS OF THE WEEK	415	LEGAL NEWS	421
IN PARLIAMENT	417	WINDING-UP NOTICES	421
SOCIETIES	418	CREDITORS' NOTICES	422
COMPANIES	418	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	423

Cases Reported this Week.

Haydock v. Goodier ...	416
Mountain v. Whittle ...	415
Welsh Hospital (Netley) Fund: Thomas v. The Attorney	
General ...	417

Current Topics.

The Law of Property Bill.

WE CONSIDER certain aspects of the Law of Property Bill elsewhere. The Lord Chancellor appears to entertain some hope, though no very great hope, that it will become law this session; that is, in the course of the summer. It is not proposed that the Act shall come into operation before 1st January, 1923, so that, if it passes, there will be the chance of making alterations next year, and this may be the better course, for we have no desire to see the measure in its present form placed permanently upon the Statute Book. The fact is that the Lord Chancellor has not shown the confidence in his own scheme which is usually supposed to be a mark of his character, and has allowed himself to be persuaded to drop its most significant features.

The Compromise on Part I.

THAT PART I of the Bill of last year was as bold an innovation as was desirable we are not prepared to say. That the present Bill falls far short of the reform of real property law which is urgently required we can say with much confidence. We are aware that there has been a conflict of opinion between eminent conveyancers, and we desire to speak with respect of both sides. But we do not observe in the present Bill the distinctive features of last year's Bill, which were suggested by Mr. UNDERHILL's pamphlet "The Line of Least Resistance." Mr. UNDERHILL's scheme was not put forward as a sufficient reform, but as giving the most that was practicable. It was approved by the Transfer of Land Committee, of which Mr. LESLIE SCOTT was chairman, and it was the basis upon which Lord HALDANE's Bill was remodelled into the Bill of last year. Of course, there is much in Mr. UNDERHILL's suggestions—such as the abolition of copyhold tenure—which finds a place in the present Bill. But the main features of his scheme have been set aside or substantially altered, and quite too much importance has been attached to the opposition of Lord CAVE. Last year's Bill was approved by Lord HALDANE and Lord BUCKMASTER, but, with the Lord Chancellor, they have deferred to Lord CAVE, and allowed Part I of the Bill to be whittled down. We do not presume to weigh legal opinions in so exalted a sphere, but, of course, all these noble lords have been for many years removed from the actual practice of

conveyancing, and, indeed, they were too soon withdrawn from it to the more exciting and profitable career of advocacy to be able to pose as great conveyancers. For profound knowledge of real property law, and for great experience in conveyancing we look elsewhere, and we regret that the Lord Chancellor has adopted the path of compromise, instead of proceeding boldly with the scheme—as we have said, by no means an advanced one—which was at first submitted to him on very high authority.

The Agriculture (Amendment) Bill.

IT WAS suggested by correspondents in these columns (*ante*, p. 290) shortly after the passing of the Agriculture Act, 1920, that in making a "minor amendment" of s. 1 (1) of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1908, the word "if" had been dropped, and a serious inroad thereby made on a tenant's right to compensation for improvements. A Bill to remedy this mistake and some other matters in the recent Act has been introduced in the House of Lords, and we print it elsewhere. It will be seen that instead of "if," as suggested, it inserts the words "in a case where," which have practically the same meaning; but when the Bill came on for second reading on the 17th inst. it was felt to be a very marked example of legislation by reference, and the debate was adjourned till after Easter in order that there might be a chance of studying its proposals.

Sir John Macdonell.

WE VERY MUCH regret to have to record the death on the 17th inst. of Sir JOHN MACDONELL. Those who were familiar with his work in the courts did not always realise how small a part, comparatively, that represented of his real interest in the law and in the wider spheres of history and philosophy. Called to the Bar at the Middle Temple in 1873, he had for some years a considerable practice, but he gave this up in 1889 to accept appointment as a Master of the King's Bench Division, and in 1912 he became Senior Master and King's Remembrancer, a position from which he retired a year ago. To those who are mainly concerned with the work of the courts he was, perhaps, best known by his editorship of the Judicial Statistics, to which he prefixed interesting dissertations well calculated to make the "dry bones" live. But to those whose interest in law is of a wider kind he was familiar as one of the leading students and exponents of Comparative and International Law—pursuits which were marked officially by his appointment as Quain Professor at University College, and in literature by his editorship of "The Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law," and his Presidency—in 1919 in succession to Professor GOUDY, whose death also has been recently reported—of the newly-formed Grotius Society. The fifth volume of the "Transactions" of that Society contains—in addition to an excellent portrait of him—his Presidential Address on the Influence of Grotius. But these more abstract studies did not represent the full extent of his interest in law. He prepared for Lord GORELL's Commission a Historical Sketch of the Laws relating to Divorce, and somewhat later, when the question of trusts and profiteering was coming to the front, he prepared for the Committee on Trusts a paper on the Law Relating to Combinations, the full results of which have not yet been realised. We are glad to remember that he appreciated the publicity we gave to this paper by re-publishing it (63 SOL. J., p. 739, and see p. 758). Little known to the world in general, and without the public reputation that comes from high judicial position, Sir JOHN MACDONELL was nevertheless a man of great distinction, and afforded a somewhat unusual example of the union of academic and learned pursuits with practical knowledge of the law.

Prescriptive Claims to Judicial Office.

IN AN ARTICLE two weeks ago we referred to the action taken by Mr. GLADSTONE when the Attorney-General, Sir HENRY JAMES, raised, in 1873, the question whether or not the old prescriptive claim of the senior law-officer to the office of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas had been replaced by a similar

claim to the office of Lord Chief Justice of England, in which the other had been merged by the Judicature Act of 1873. Mr. GLADSTONE's note to Sir HENRY is interesting as well as instructive, and it may be useful to quote it here *in extenso* :—

"There have been certain loose and ill-authenticated traditions of an absolute title in the Attorney-General, if not in both Law Officers, by virtue of their offices, to succeed to particular Judgeships. They were of a nature to cause possible embarrassment and pain, rather than to convey any right. The Government consider that, with the passing of the Judicature Act of last Session, and the modifications that it has effected in the position of the Judgeships generally, all such traditions, or shadows of traditions, finally drop. The future preferences of the Law Officers, from time to time, will, as we conceive, be sufficiently assured by consideration of their services, abilities, learning and position."

As a matter of fact no question arose before Mr. GLADSTONE's administration went out of office in 1874. The question did arise however, in 1880. Sir ALEXANDER COCKBURN retired in November of that year and Lord COLERIDGE was appointed in his place. But Sir HENRY JAMES, who was then again Attorney-General, was, in fact, offered the appointment by Mr. GLADSTONE and refused it. Later on he refused the Chancellorship because he disagreed with Mr. GLADSTONE on the question of Home Rule. Sir JOHN SIMON and Lord MANSFIELD are believed to have refused the Woolsack, but Lord JAMES of Hereford, we imagine, is the only person who ever refused both the Chief Justiceship and the Chancellorship. He did not, however, do so on the ground of "*Nolo Episcopari*," and later on became a valued member of the supreme tribunal of the Empire.

Hypnotism and the Investigation of Crime.

THE COURT of Criminal Appeal had to consider on Monday in *Rez v. Quarmby* (*Times*, 22nd inst.), a case which has excited some public interest and which has been the subject of correspondence in our columns. It will be recollected that the prisoner, a man of forty-five, who had lived a blameless life until infatuation for a woman led him astray, confessed the murder of his mistress, but pleaded "Irresistible Impulse," on indictment for the crime before Mr. Justice ACTON at Blackpool. The crime was clearly premeditated, as he had purchased the knife with which it was committed some time beforehand; he was convicted and sentenced to death, but at the trial some rather remarkable evidence was given as regards the state of the prisoner's mind by an official doctor. The prisoner had confessed, but the state of his mind was in doubt. The doctor accordingly, with the prisoner's consent, subjected him to hypnotism and interrogated him as to the crime while under hypnotic influence. The object of Dr. WILKINSON, the doctor in question, was the humane one of trying to ascertain whether or not the prisoner's mind was normal. The result of his investigation, which was conducted on lines of psycho-analysis, would appear to have been that the prisoner, who up to middle life had led a continent life and then had suddenly yielded to sensual temptation, was the victim of a "complex" which had gradually acquired force, until it had become an "irresistible impulse" which the prisoner could not resist. How far such a theory is capable of being maintained in psychology or in medicine we cannot pretend to say: it opens up an additional and novel possibility. But clearly such a defence is unknown to the law of England, and the Court of Criminal Appeal could do nothing else than dismiss the prisoner's appeal.

Psycho-pathology in the Forum.

IN THE COURSE of *Rez v. Quarmby* (*supra*), Mr. Justice DARLING, who presided, pointed out the obvious difficulties which beset an English judge who has to sum up to a jury in a case where a plea of insanity has been put forward on behalf of the prisoner. So long as he confines himself to laying down the law in accordance with the rule in *Macnaghten's Case* he is fairly safe. But if he attempts a more modern or benevolent view of the issues, then he is apt to go astray and may easily misdirect a jury. Nor is he much helped at present by medical evidence, which is not as a rule up-to-date in the understanding of mental diseases. The learned judge suggested, perhaps not too seriously, that it might be a

good thing to have an official "hypnotist" in every criminal court. But many a true word is spoken in jest. Curiously enough, an "official hypnotist" has existed in the Municipal Court of Chicago ever since that Court was reformed in 1909. At least, there does exist a Psycho-pathological laboratory attached to the court, where each accused person suspected of mental deficiency has to undergo examination by an expert. The methods adopted are those of Psycho-analysis as practised by Psychiatrists in this country and the Continent, as well as in America. An exceedingly interesting account of the court and the methods employed, and of the statistical results, will be found in the *Central Law Journal*, the leading American legal newspaper of the Middle West, in two articles dated 4th and 11th February respectively. All accused persons who come before the court are liable, under the statute incorporating it and conferring jurisdiction upon it, to undergo this examination. This includes four classes of persons, namely, juvenile offenders of both sexes, persons accused of indecent or immoral offences in the "Court of Morals," husbands summoned before the "Court of Domestic Relations" by their wives on a charge of neglecting to maintain them, and ordinary criminals who appear as defendants in the general court. Valuable statistics on the mentality of criminals have in this way been compiled, and it is claimed by the officials of the court that criminals generally, but especially children, immoral persons and wife-deserters, show signs of well-marked neurotic deficiency. We incline to think that these statistics are a little overdone. In America, where law and public opinion make the average husband little better than a slave and a beast of burden for the benefit of his wife, we should be inclined to suspect that wife-deserters are simply unfortunate men cursed with a more than usually tyrannical spouse, whose natural love of liberty—supposed to be an American characteristic—asserts itself in this way.

Jurywomen in America.

EN PASSANT we may note that the United States, having amended its Constitution so as to remove all sex disqualification, is suffering from the same difficulties as ourselves in connexion with the presence of women on juries. But judges in America seem bolder in the exercise of their discretion to exclude either sex from serving in particular cases than any English judge would dare to be. Only the other day Judge MORRIS, of New York, in directing the empanelling of a jury composed equally of both sexes to try a matrimonial dispute, expressly ordered that no "blonde" should be selected from the panel, because of the notorious fickleness of "blondes." Were any English judge to have attempted this, we fear that a mob of militants would have burned down his dwelling or tarred him and feathered him. But perhaps Judge MORRIS was more artful than daring. No doubt he had first satisfied himself that all the feminine members of the panel were "brunettes," so that no lady in attendance would feel insulted. For, of course, in a modern community nine women out of ten are "brunettes." "Blondes" are dying out, so anthropologists tell us. This is due to the disappearance of the great "Nordic" or "Scandinavian-Siberian" race, whose conquest of Europe thirty thousand years ago built up Aryan civilization. But this race is dying out. The conquered and assimilated "Alpine" and "Mediterranean" varieties of the white race, both dark-haired, are gradually eliminating the superior "Nordic" race, which tends to perish with the decay of aristocracies and the non-reproduction of the upper and upper middle classes. At least, such is the favourite thesis of present-day anthropologists at meetings of the British Association and other appropriate gatherings.

Erasmus in England.

WE SUGGESTED last week that Mr. Justice DARLING may have learned from FROUDE's Essays rather than from the original the views of DESIDERIUS ERASMUS upon the English custom of "kissing" in the days of the Renaissance. We have found the passage in FROUDE, and it may interest readers; for he says much

about the English people of his day which an experienced lawyer and man of the world will recognise as not wholly untrue even in this age of democracy. "You are going to England," wrote ERASMUS to his correspondent. "You will not fail to be pleased. You will find the great people there most agreeable and gracious, only be careful not to presume upon their intimacy. They will condescend to your level. But do not therefore suppose that you stand upon theirs. The noble lords are gods in their own eyes. For the other classes be courteous, give your right hand, do not take the wall, do not push yourself. Smile on whom you please, but trust no one that you do not know; above all, speak no evil of England to them. They are proud of their country above all nations in the world, as they have good reason to be." And then comes the passage on kissing, not by any means literally translated by FROUDE. "English ladies are divinely pretty and too good-natured. They have an excellent custom amongst them, that wherever you go the girls kiss you. They kiss you when you come and they kiss you when you go, they kiss you at intervening opportunities, and their lips are soft, warm, and delicious." It will be observed, as we pointed out last week, that it is the young girls, not the grown-up ladies, who are represented as giving these caresses.

Temple Bar.

MOST LAWYERS will regret the refusal of Sir HEDWORTH MEUX to restore to the City the ancient and venerable monument of "Temple Bar" which in 1878 was removed from its old site and in 1887 was given to the late Sir HENRY MEUX, who set up the stones as a lodge-entrance to his estate at Cheshunt, Hertfordshire. But it must be frankly conceded that Sir HEDWORTH is well within his moral as well as his legal rights in retaining property which cost his predecessor in title £15,000 to remove and re-erect, and which had been thrown away as old lumber by a vandalistic Common Council of the City of London. Certainly, if the return of the monument is desired, the expenses incurred by the MEUX family forty years ago ought to be reimbursed. Probably difficulties of a financial kind make it impracticable at the present moment for those interested to offer such reimbursement to Sir HEDWORTH, and therefore any further approach to that gallant admiral must be postponed for the present. But those who love Old London will not despair of securing the return of the stones some day.

The History of Temple Bar.

FOR TEMPLE BAR is of very peculiar interest to all who read DICKENS, or live in the City or are concerned with the law. It was the legal barrier which marked the boundary of the City. Westward of the Bar came a series of "Liberties," which intervened between the City and Westminster. The greatest of these "Liberties" was the Temple, or rather the two Temples. But there were others, for example the Savoy. What had happened was this: The river in the Middle Ages ran along the southern shores of the Strand from St. Paul's to Whitehall Palace. Gradually, pieces of the foreshore were reclaimed by great nobles, or prelates, or corporations, and as these were recovered from the tidal river, they were a kind of "No man's land," not included in any manor or parish. So the owners got grants from the Crown with independent manorial jurisdiction and privileges which excluded them at once from the City, from Westminster, and from the adjacent parishes of Middlesex. Temple Bar is a very real memorial of these ancient days. It was built just as they were becoming obsolete in the reign of Charles II, whose law officers questioned by *quo warranto* the charters and jurisdictions of nearly every ancient corporation. Temple Bar, in its present form, was rebuilt from the designs of Sir CHRISTOPHER WREN after the Great Fire of London; it was completed in 1672. Here Royalty, whenever it entered the City, was received with all stately ceremonial by the Lord Mayor. The last sovereign to pass through it was Queen Victoria in 1872, when she visited St. Paul's to return thanks for the recovery of the Prince of Wales from his illness. Here the Iron Duke was mobbed by the City Whigs

on his return from a City banquet in 1830, and was defended by the doughty "prentices" of the law, who turned out with staves and sticks from every court and set of chambers to drive back his hooligan assailants. A guard of honour, formed of barristers, rallied round his coach and escorted it up to Apsley House. Many equally famous scenes will occur to all who love the lore of City history. It is surely fitting that the memorial of so many striking events in the history of London should find a resting place at the foot of Bell-yard, or in the Temple, somewhere not too far from its ancient site.

Munificent Gift to the Royal Air Force Memorial Fund.

DURING THE WAR Ascot was one of the great centres of activity for the Royal Air Force, and many houses and premises, including the buildings on the racecourse, were requisitioned for their occupation. In the early days of the war, Mrs. SALTING, one of the most public-spirited local residents, placed two fine houses at the absolute disposal of the Government, free of all cost, and these were occupied by officers and men of the R.A.F. and later partly by the W.R.A.F. At the termination of the war this lady handed over the Crown leases to the Air Council so that the houses might be sold for the benefit of the R.A.F. Memorial Fund in recognition of the great work of the R.A.F. during the war. The amount realised is to be earmarked more particularly to fund scholarships or bursaries for the education of the children of officers who died while serving with the R.A.F. during the war. The houses called "Woodcote" and "Heath End" are very delightful properties, each standing in grounds of four or five acres, directly overlooking the racecourse and common, and it is now announced that they are to be sold by auction at the St. James' Estate Rooms on 19th April next. Messrs. HAMPTON and Sons, of 20, St. James' Square, the auctioneers who are acting in the disposal, inform us that the gift is obviously one of the value of several thousands of pounds, the houses being two of the best moderate-sized places in the district. Both of them are in excellent repair and will be offered with vacant possession on completion. It is greatly to be hoped that the sale will be well attended and that the bidding will be brisk in order that the R.A.F. Memorial Fund may benefit to the full by Mrs. SALTING's munificence.

The New Part I of the Law of Property Bill.

WE printed last week Part I of the Law of Property Bill as it has been altered to suit the objections made against it by Lord CAVE. To appreciate the changes, it is, of course, necessary to take the Bill of last year, as amended by the Joint Select Committee, and compare it with the present Bill. If this is done, it will be seen that a good many improvements have been made in drafting. In particular, the three clauses which repeated for legal and equitable powers the provisions relating to legal estates and equitable interests, have been withdrawn as separate clauses, and powers are treated with and as incidental to estates and interests; and the provisions as to contracts have been re-arranged and brought together in clause 7 of the new Bill. More substantial changes are the withdrawal of the old Clause 4, which restricted the modes by which equitable interests could be created; and of Clauses 10 and 25 (1), which restricted the modes by which legal estates could be conveyed. The clauses as to protecting purchasers against death duties and bankruptcies remain practically unchanged, and are a very beneficial feature of the scheme; and there are numerous other points in which the Bill is unchanged. Mortgages will be made, as in the conveyancing of a former day, by the creation of terms of years; the entirety of land held in undivided shares will be vested in trustees for sale, and the Partition Acts, with their difficult and expensive procedure, will be abolished; and the legal estates of infants will be vested in trustees. Further,

some important changes have been made in response to criticism quite distinct from the attack made on Part I by Lord CAVE. Of these, the most interesting is the new proviso to Clause 17 (2), which abolishes the Rule in *Shelley's Case*, and the old Clause 26, which provided that land held on charitable trusts should be held on trust for sale, with power to postpone, appears in the new Clause 26 as a provision that such land shall be deemed to be settled land, and the trustees shall have the Settled Land Act powers.

The above will, we think, be found to give a fair view of the new Part I, apart from the changes made to meet Lord CAVE's objections, and the general effect no doubt is to improve the Bill. The changes made in deference to Lord CAVE consist of the withdrawal of Clause 1—the assimilation clause—and the replacing of Clause 3—the "curtain" clause—by a new clause designed to protect purchasers against equitable interests in a different manner. The old Clause 1 placed assimilation of real to personal property in the forefront of the scheme by converting the fee simple into a chattel real. It was one more step in the development in this direction which the law has already undergone. Freehold estates were assimilated to chattels real when the action of ejectment was substituted for the old real actions. Some centuries later and quite recently, freehold estates were assimilated to chattels real for the purpose of devolution to personal representatives. One more step, and freehold estates would have been put for all purposes on the footing of chattels real, and the law of immovables would have been unified. We are told that there can be no assimilation of real and personal property law because land is not a chattel. Those who use this argument seem to forget that the substantial distinction is not between freehold estates as real property, and leasehold estates and chattels as personal property; but between immovables and movables, and sooner or later freehold and leasehold estates are bound to be assimilated. But it seems that this is not to be done at present. According to the Lord Chancellor—to quote from his speech on the 17th inst., on the second reading—the opposition to the assimilation clauses was "mainly based upon the apprehension that if they passed into law alterations in the law would collaterally spring from those changes, the full extent of which the most learned persons could not predict," and the Lord Chancellor has deferred to these apprehensions—at least, he is content to drop the direct assimilation of the old Clause 1 (the conversion of fee simple estates into chattels real), and to rely on the indirect assimilation resulting from other parts of the Bill. "The result of Part I of the Bill, and in particular of Clauses 1 and 3 taken together with Clause 72 [Abolition of technicalities in regard to Conveyances and Deeds] with Part V [Abolition of Copyhold and Customary Tenure] and with Part VIII [Amendment of the Law of Intestacy], is to effect, in substance, the assimilation at which we aim." So that, although direct assimilation is abandoned, Lord BIRKENHEAD considers that he gets the substance, while to Lord CAVE he leaves only the shadow. It may be so, but more probably Lord CAVE's intervention has simply put off the day for the radical reform of the law of real property which is bound to come. On the other side, we have Lord BUCKMASTER's candid avowal that his "desire would be to abolish every law relating to real property to-morrow and begin afresh." Certainly this is not an unnatural outburst when we see how the present Bill, instead of being, as it should be, boldly revolutionary, is, as the prefatory memorandum says, only "evolutionary."

The other clause in which the critics of last year's Bill have had their way is Clause 3, in which the "curtain provisions" have disappeared, and are replaced by a scheme which may, perhaps, in practice be as effective, but which seems to miss the simplicity of the former Bill. It must be remembered that the main object of Part I is to simplify the law as between vendor and purchaser, and enable private conveyancing to compete with registration. If it does not do this, it is useless. Incidentally, it may effect a simplification in beneficial titles, and no doubt throughout the Bill, in the amendments of the Conveyancing Acts and other statutes, and

notably in the abolition of copyholds, there is very much which will make for simplification of the law. We should be sorry if any remarks of ours gave the impression that we overlook the great services which have been rendered by the conveyancers interested in the Bill in making it comprehensive of the reforms in detail, and in many cases in matters of principle, for which the Law of Property calls—not least in Part VIII, which amends the law as to intestacy. But just now we are on Part I, and we are considering whether the new Clause 3 is as effective as the old one for enabling the purchaser to take a title from the legal owner and disregard the equities behind the legal estate. The old Clause 3 was so frequently under discussion last year that we may assume it to be sufficiently familiar. Its principle was that all interests other than legal estates would be put behind a curtain consisting of either a trust for sale or a settlement. This, like the proposal to turn the fee simple into a chattel real estate, was adopted by the Land Transfer Committee, which reported at the end of 1919, from Mr. UNDERHILL's pamphlet "The Line of Least Resistance," and the Bill of last year was in effect Lord HALDANE's Bill of 1914 altered so as to include these proposals. Or rather, perhaps, we should say, the curtain clause was an ingenious development of Mr. UNDERHILL's scheme. But the main principle of the Bill—the power of the owner of the legal estate to transfer free from equities—is a good deal older than Lord HALDANE's Bill and is to be found in the late Mr. WOLSTENHOLME's Bill of 1897.

Under the old Clause 3, all land was actually or notionally to be subject to a trust for sale or a settlement, and equities were over-ridden by a legal conveyance, and transferred to the purchase money. Beneficial owners were protected by the requirement that the purchase money should be paid to trustees. This scheme was open to the objection that it rested upon a fiction and required things to be deemed to exist which did not in fact exist. But the fiction was introduced for the definite purpose of enabling title to be made as readily—or nearly as readily—by a few short entries in an abstract as by corresponding entries in an official register. It was designed to enable investigation of title by abstract of deeds to compete with investigation of title by extracts from a register. This was its only reason and its only justification. Apart from this, there was no ground for introducing notional trusts for sale or notional settlements. But with this object in view the notional trust for sale and the notional settlement were simple and effective machinery for attaining it.

The new Clause 3 is included in the extracts from the Bill which we printed last week, and we very much doubt whether it will be found equally simple, and equally effective as between vendor and purchaser, for that, as we have pointed out, is the sole—or, at least, the main—test. The idea of a "curtain" is dropped, and in lieu thereof, a purchaser of a legal estate is told that he is not concerned with equitable interests "to which this section applies," whether he has notice or not, save as provided by s.s. (2). So that we start with two qualifications of the protection. First, he has to consider the equitable interests to which the section applies. These include all equitable interests with the exceptions mentioned in s.s. (4), namely (i) restrictive covenants; (ii) equitable easements or privileges; (iii) contracts; and (iv) certain interests protected by entry in any of the registers under the Land Charges, &c., Act, 1888. But a purchaser of a legal estate will not be affected by interests under (i), (ii) and (iii) unless, (a) if created before the commencement of the Act, he has notice; or (b) if created after, then it is registered as a land charge. So that a purchaser may be affected either by notice or by registered entries, or both. And, secondly, he must consider whether protection against equitable interests is excluded by s.s. (2). He will find there that he cannot disregard an equitable interest of which he has notice unless (i) it is bound by an order of the court, or protected by a trust for sale or a settlement, and (ii) the purchase money is paid into court or to trustees. Then s.s. (3) provides for protection being afforded by a trust for sale or a settlement. It may be that the result is to give

practically the same facilities for a sale as the former "curtain" provisions, combined with entries on the land charges or other register; and we understand that the new machinery is thought by some to be simpler than that of the former Bill. Possibly, after prolonged consideration, it might be possible to accept this view. But for the present we must express grave doubt whether the dropping of the "curtain" provisions has not damaged the Bill even more than the dropping of the direct assimilation of freehold estates to chattels real. The Lord Chancellor in the course of the speech to which we have already referred, said that the Bill "will for the first time lay it down and make it clear in practice that the land does not exist for lawyers, but that lawyers, after all, exist for the land." Any layman who thinks of buying land can be recommended to read Clause 3 and then go ahead without his lawyer, if he likes. We can see him handing back the clause and saying he is "not having any". Part I may go through as a compromise, and of course the rest of the Bill is, in general, safe from criticism; but any real reform of the Law of Real Property will not be made as a matter of compromise, but by a competent draftsman who is allowed a free hand, and no such reform will be effected by the present Bill.

The Citation of Reports.

A CURIOUS POINT of view was expressed recently by the Llandysilis (Montgomeryshire) Petty Sessional Bench, apparently on the advice of their clerk, in the case of *Ministry of Food v. Anon* (*Times*, 16th inst.), the prosecution of a publican by the Ministry on an alleged overcharge for a glass of beer. The prosecuting counsel desired to quote to the Bench a case reported in *The Times*, in its Law Report column, 14th April, 1920; but the defending solicitor successfully objected. The bench refused to allow the case to be cited on the ground that a report of a case elsewhere than in the Official Law Reports must be proved by the barrister who reports it; secondary evidence of the decision cannot be given; at least such would appear to be their view as expressed in the somewhat abbreviated report in *The Times*, just quoted. Since the Reports of *The Times* are well understood to be made by barristers, and edited by a barrister who vouches for their correctness, and are habitually accepted in the High Court, it would seem that the bench were under some misapprehension as to the principle which prevails in the citation of Law Reports.

In the first place, it is quite an erroneous view to apply to such cases the rules of evidence. The citation of a judicial decision is not the adduction of evidence at all. It is an illustration of the principle of "judicial notice." This means that certain matters do not require to be and cannot be proved to a court by testimony of any kind whatsoever; the court is supposed to know these matters *proprio motu* and not to need evidence of them. But the court in practice refreshes its memory by consulting almanacs, encyclopædias, or other works of reference in order to verify its innate sense of the truth on the matter in issue. Such is the legal fiction. Now English law, as distinct from foreign law, is one of those matters of which the court takes judicial notice, i.e., is presumed to know. Foreign law, on the contrary, is not known to our judges and must be proved like any other matter of mixed fact and theory by means of an expert witness. Curiously enough, Scots law is deemed to be foreign law and therefore must be proved by the testimony of an expert in every English court except the House of Lords: *Cooper v. Cooper* (1888, 13 App. Cas. 88). The House of Lords, however, as the "*commune forum* of the three countries" (per Lord WATSON in *Cooper v. Cooper*, *supra*, at p. 104), takes judicial notice of Scots law on a Scottish appeal. Irish law is English law, not foreign law (*Re Nesbitt*, 1844, 14 L.J.M.C. 30), and therefore every English court takes judicial notice of it. Colonial law is in a somewhat unsettled position; but probably the correct rule is that the statute law of a colony can be proved by producing an authorised copy of the statute, of which the court will take judicial notice,

but that the common law of the colony is matter of evidence or matter of judicial notice according as the colony in question has adopted the common law of England or possesses some separate system such as the Roman-Dutch law. Under s. 15 of the Administration of Justice Act, 1920, the fact as to foreign law is now decided by the judge and not by the jury.

In accordance with the above principle the court takes judicial notice of every branch of English law, and this includes :—

- (1) The principles of the common law ;
- (2) The maxims of equity ;
- (3) The rules of ecclesiastical law, maritime law, and International law: *Chandler v. Grieves* (1792, 2 H. Bl., 606, note (a)) ;
- (4) The orders of the Crown, issued pursuant to statute, e.g., the Articles of War and rules made under the Army Act: *Bradley v. Arthur* (1825 4, B. & C., 292, 304) ;
- (5) The law and customs of Parliament ;
- (6) Privilege of Parliament, and the course of Parliamentary procedure: *Stockdale v. Hansard* (1839, 9 A. & E., 1, 112) ;
- (7) The privileges of Royal Palaces: *A-G. v. Dakin* (1870, L.R. 4 H. L. 338) ;
- (8) The usages of the Law Merchant: *Jones v. Peppercorne* (1858, 28 L.J. Ch. 158) ;
- (9) The decisions of any of His Majesty's courts: *Lane's Case* (2 Co. Rep. 16b).

But, while the judges take judicial notice of decisions, they in practice accept the assistance of the bar in refreshing the memory of the court by calling to mind any decision which the court has temporarily overlooked. In mediæval times, this was the special function of the barrister known as the "King's Remembrancer," now a Master of the Crown Office. In every city court it was the function of the Recorder to certify local customs, and in the City of London the Recorder still certifies the local customs of the City of London, which on receipt of his certificate are thereupon judicially noticed by the court: *Piper v. Chappell* (1845, 14 M. & W. 624). This duty, as regards other courts, however, has now devolved upon the bar at large. Every barrister is entitled to call the attention of the court to a decision, on any point in issue, whether he be a party to a case or merely a spectator in court. Reporters are simply barristers who make a practice of noting decisions and assisting the judge by publishing their notes in the form of reports, verified by their signature or initials. It is not necessary that each case reported should be verified by a barrister's signature: it is sufficient as in the case of *The Times*, that the reports are vouched for by the editor as the work of a barrister. The verification of a report, then, by a barrister's signature is not "secondary evidence" of the fact that the judge named therein delivered a certain judgment in the hearing of the barrister; it is simply an accepted mode of indicating to the court that the assistance it is receiving comes from a member of the bar. The court takes judicial notice of the point, whether or not any particular report is that of a barrister and otherwise reliable.

In practice, a certain amount of doubt exists as to the routine of the court in accepting or rejecting certain classes of reports. Every set of Law Reports regularly issued, purporting to be complete, and verified by a barrister's signature *in full*, is always accepted without question; this includes not only the Law Reports but the Law Journal Reports, Law Times Reports, Times Law Reports, Solicitors' Journal Reports, and the Commercial Cases and several other sets of specialised reports. The *locus classicus*, which concerned *The Times* weekly Law Reports, is *Thorey v. Orchard S.S. Company Limited* (1906, 1 K.B., at p. 245), where Mr. Justice CHANNELL states the rule. The Weekly Notes and other weekly journals whose reports are verified only by the initials of the reporting barrister, appear to be accepted only on practice points, or where no other report exists (see Annual Practice, 1921, p. 1917). *The Times* daily reports, although not verified by signature or initials, are well known to be the work of barristers, and therefore are in practice never objected to in the High Courts. In the absence

of anything better, even the transcript of a shorthand note made by a barrister, or vouched for by one as accurate, will be accepted: *Renshaw v. Dixon* (1911, W.N. 40). There the note was of a judgment delivered so long ago as 1838.

Psycho-Analysis in the Courts.

In the recent criminal appeal of *Rex v. Quarmby* (*Times*, 22nd inst.), where a murderer convicted at Blackpool Assizes appealed against his conviction on the ground of misdirection as to the facts by Mr. Justice Acton, the court dismissed the appeal in view of the fact that the learned judge had correctly stated the rule of law on "insanity" as laid down eighty years ago in the *locus classicus*, *Macnaghten's Case* (1843, 10 Cl. & F. 200). But Mr. Justice DARLING, in delivering the judgment of the court, pointed out one great difficulty under which learned judges labour, in dealing with a plea of "impulsive insanity," and in commenting on the evidence of medical experts, namely, their complete ignorance of the modern scientific and medical aspects of what is known in present-day philosophy as the "New Psychology," popularly but not very accurately called "Psycho-analysis." This, no doubt, does constitute a grave difficulty, and, we fear, may easily lead to miscarriages of justice.

Incidentally, it may be pointed out that the education of barristers, from whose ranks all judges are selected, is not well fitted to prepare the future counsel or judge for dealing with many phenomena of modern life. An English barrister, beyond a very perfunctory examination in general knowledge, from which he is excused if he has matriculated at any British university, is not required to study anything but jurisprudence in its various forms. The result is that the English Bar, as a body, is not well-informed on many matters with which foreign and American lawyers are expected to be familiar, e.g., Economics, Psychology, and even the Principles of Logic. With the Scots Bar it is different. The examination of a Scots advocate includes in its general subjects both moral and mental philosophy, which in the Scots universities, until recently, meant that under the heading of moral philosophy, economics and ethics were studied, while mental philosophy included psychology and logic. Again, in his professional legal examination there is included "Medical Jurisprudence," which is a comprehensive subject covering a number of topics from Toxicology to Mental Pathology. The result is that Scots advocates and judges are better equipped for dealing with many classes of cases, especially the technical aspects of poison-trials and insanity pleas, than are their less thoroughly educated English brethren. If and when the new University of Law, so often talked about, is created, we hope that some effort will be made to improve the somewhat antiquated methods of legal education still in vogue in the Inns of Court.

And here we should like to make another suggestion. We borrow the idea from the new Army School of Military Administration at Chisleton Camp. To that School of Instruction every commanding officer has on appointment to go for a three months' course in Economics and other subjects which assist in the administration of a military unit. And in the future, we believe, such officers will be expected at intervals of a few years to undergo "Reviver" courses in the same subjects. Now, we do not suggest for a moment that judges or barristers should be expected to go through "Instructional" or "Reviver" courses of law and subjects ancillary to law. But it does seem to us quite feasible and highly desirable that justices and their clerks should be given facilities for the acquisition of essential legal principles by attending short courses of instruction at the Law Courts, or the Law Society, or the Inns of Court. We believe that the more enlightened justices would eagerly welcome such opportunities. In fact, women justices are apparently organising something of the sort for their own especial benefit. In any such course, we think, the "New Psychology" in its forensic aspects might well be included as one of the subjects in the curriculum. Perhaps, even, some learned judges of the High Court would not despise an opportunity of attending such a course of lectures in the capacity of honoured guests.

Now, there are quite a number of different ways in which the "New Psychology" is of the utmost importance in the administration of the law. One of these relates to Evidence; another concerns the pathology of the insane; and a third affects certain forms of crime committed chiefly by juveniles and by women of respectable character. The first of the matters just enumerated is probably the one in which Psycho-analysis will ultimately have most to teach us. It must be admitted that at present our English methods of sifting evidence in court are in the highest degree unsatisfactory. A witness is placed in the box. There he or she is subjected to a series of questions at the hands of cross-examining counsel with the object of shaking the evidence given in examination-in-chief. The jury are told to "watch the demeanour of the witness" and decide therefrom whether or not such witness is or is not "a witness of truth." To men of science all this is highly unsatisfactory.

To begin with, neither judge nor jury have any specialized training in "watching the demeanour" of witnesses. They do not know the scientific principles which the new school of Psychology has been slowly elaborating as a means of judging such demeanour. In fact, their judgment of demeanour is superficial in the extreme. A cool witness is generally believed. Yet the psychologist well knows that "coolness" is a mark of the skilful liar and also of the recklessly imaginative person. A woman

of hysterical type will tell a false story in the box with the utmost coolness of demeanour and be consistent even in the most meticulous details. An honest woman will hesitate, admit on pressure that she may be mistaken, and, generally, tell a halting story. Again, policemen who have concocted their testimony at the police station will roll it off without turning a hair; in fact, a lying policeman—who unfortunately is not a mere myth—is well-known to Old Bailey counsel as the most dangerous of all lying witnesses; he “knows the ropes,” and so is careful to avoid inconsistencies or improbabilities. Nervous and confused witnesses are always disbelieved; yet the man of science knows that they are often the most truthful. Neither judges nor juries seem as yet to have much grasp of the criteria by which truth is to be distinguished from falsehood. Nor can counsel assist them much, for counsel are themselves ignorant. The whole machinery and technique of cross-examination is quite out of date.

Now, as a matter of fact, psychologists in France and America have built up a system by which it is possible to detect “truth” from “falsity” with some degree of scientific exactitude and certainty. Various devices enter into this method. One consists in ascertaining the “tempo” of the witness, i.e., the normal rate at which his mind works in answering a question. Some minds work almost instantaneously; the question “Did A happen to B” calls up at once the symbolic reaction which we call a “judgment” in the form of a reply “No, A did not happen to B.” With other minds a few seconds normally elapse. With others, again, almost half-a-minute. Now the experienced psycho-analyst begins by putting a few purely formal questions to his subject, just like the opening questions in examination-in-chief, such as “Your name,” “Your address,” “Your occupation,” and the like. From these he calculates the normal “tempo” of the witness, i.e., the rate of his mental reaction to an idea presented to him. Of course, this rate varies with the character and recency of the event so presented; but for this allowance is made. So, when cross-examination is reached, the analyst quickly finds out two things; in some cases the subject answers the question in his proper time-limit, but in other cases he takes much longer. Experience shows that, subject to certain qualifications due to peculiar causes which we cannot discuss in detail, in the former case the witness is giving a straightforward and candid answer; in the latter case he is giving a concocted answer in order to evade candour. This is a far better test of candour than any observation of demeanour.

Now, when an experienced psycho-analyst finds that his subject is giving calculated, not candid, replies to certain questions, he at once proceeds to discover the reason. It does not follow that the witness is trying to conceal the truth. That is only one possible explanation. Another is that the witness finds something disagreeable in an idea called up by the question; his mind tries to repress this suggestion of disagreeableness; and the effort to protect himself against it takes up time. For example, a boy is asked, “Did you cross the orchard on your way to school?” He takes fifteen seconds to reply, “Yes, I did,” whereas his “tempo” is only five seconds per reply. It does not follow in the least that he is lying. The explanation may be that he once stole some apples from a tree and was severely punished in consequence; his mind tries to “repress” the disagreeable memory of the punishment by shutting out the idea of an orchard or an apple altogether. The result is that, when his attention is directed to either, he has first of all to overcome the disagreeable association by an effort before he can think out the question and give a reply. It is necessary, therefore, to discover whether or not the breach of “tempo” is due to deliberate evasion or to the “protective instinct” of the mind which endeavours to repel an unpleasant idea.

Again, still another reason may account for our schoolboy's failure to reply in due time. He may have a “complex,” that is to say, a group of ideas in his mind which is unlocked by the idea contained in the question. For example, our schoolboy may have a strong natural bent towards a life of farming in the colonies, but his parents may have decided to place him in a city office and have tried to repress his natural inclination for a life of colonial adventure. The result of their effort to repress may well be that the idea is driven underground; he never thinks of it deliberately and consciously, but rather strives to forget it and fall in with his parents' wishes; the result is that the idea takes up a large part of his “sub-conscious” mentality, and is always coming to the surface whenever his will is unable to act and repress it. It emerges in sleep, when the reason has no control over one's dreams, in moments of day-dreaminess when the mind is empty, and in moments of sudden shock, e.g., a street collision, when the will is off its guard. The group of ideas connected with farm-life in the colonies becomes a “complex,” which may easily be unlocked by suggestion. The putting of a question relating to an orchard, in the solemn and exciting experience of testimony in the witness-box, acts as such a key to unlock the “complex,” but the unlocking takes time, and the boy has to resist the “complex” before he can apply his mind to the question put him. Hence the abnormal slowness of his “tempo.” The trained psycho-analyst has to discover whether this may not be the explanation of the abnormality of “tempo”; and he has now elaborated a machinery for doing this.

We have given a very simple illustration to explain the methods of the experienced psychologist in dealing with a subject. The system of cross-examination in such investigations is really very elaborate; but we cannot go into details. It is enough to say that, as the result of the system properly applied by a competent investigator, it is usually not a very difficult matter to ascertain—

(1) when a witness is deliberately lying;

(2) when he is merely disturbed by a disagreeable memory and is obstructed by the necessity of repelling it;

(3) when he has a “complex” upon which the question has accidentally or deliberately impinged by his interrogatories.

Once the analyst has obtained a clear grasp of his subject's mentality, as he can generally do in the course of a few hours' conversation, he acquires an astounding capacity to tell when the subject is lying or of what hidden matters he is thinking at the moment. Only those who have had some practical experience of psycho-analysis as conducted by trained psychologists, not by the charlatans who abound at every street corner, can have any conception of the facility with which even subtle minds can be read as the result of a skillfully-conducted examination.

Here we must pause. To go into the details of this fascinating subject is outside our limits of space. The importance of psycho-analysis in connection with the testing of evidence, however, will be clear to anyone who has followed these observations of ours. Its utility in the investigation of insanity or the probing of the motives for crime is, perhaps, more doubtful. At any rate, in these spheres much less certainty has been attained, and much less advance has been made. But, for purposes of cross-examination, psycho-analysis has now been placed on a scientific foundation which renders it of the utmost possible service to all engaged in the investigation of crime. The advocate in criminal courts and the detectives of the C.I.D. branch of Scotland Yard would be well advised to add this new method to the number of their technical studies. Indeed, fifty years hence, it is probable that every advocate in the courts will find it necessary to study and practise the principles of the New Psychology almost as a matter of course.

Reviews.

Sale of Goods.

BENJAMIN ON SALE. Fourth Edition. By W. C. ALAN KER, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell. £3 3s. net.

It very often happens that in an important field of law there exist side by side two leading text-books almost equally in favour among practitioners. One such text-book treats the subject admirably from the discursive standpoint, giving every case and going into every detail; the other analyses and classifies the subject in the light of general principles. Woodfall and Fox are examples of this in connection with “Landlord and tenant”; Addison and Leake in the law of contract; and Lindell and Pollock or Salmond in the law of torts. Benjamin and Blackburn on Sale are a similar pair of contrasted text-books each equally admirable in its own way. The new edition of “Benjamin” contains all the wanted merits of its predecessors; it is excellently edited, and thoroughly up-to-date. Book V. on “Breach” may be especially recommended to practitioner.

Books of the Week.

Evidence.—Powell's Principles and Practice of the Law of Evidence. Tenth edition. By WILLIAM BLAKE ODGERS, M.A., LL.D., K.C., and WALTER BLAKE ODGERS, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Butterworth & Co. 35s. net.

CASES OF LAST SITTINGS. House of Lords.

MOUNTAIN v. WHITTLE. 10th and 11th February. 4th March.

INSURANCE (MARINE)—TIME POLICY ON HOUSEBOAT AT ANCHOR—LIBERTY TO SHIFT—DOCKING CLAUSE—TOWAGE TO DOCK FOR REPAIRS—HOUSEBOAT LOST WHILE BEING TOWED TO DOCK FOR REPAIRS—ABANDONMENT OF ADVENTURE—LIABILITY OF UNDERWRITER.

The plaintiff insured his houseboat, the D, by a time policy whilst anchored in a creek off Netley, however employed, with “liberty to shift.” The policy contained a clause, “Including all risk of docking, undocking, changing docks and going on gridirons or graving docks as may be required during the currency of this policy.” During the currency of the policy the plaintiff wished to have the D cleaned, and she was towed to a yard some seven miles up the River Itchen for that purpose. She was lashed alongside the tug, but sank outside the yard. It was found that certain seams were defective, and had opened and let in the water raised by the bow wave from the tug and tow. The plaintiff was unaware of the defect, and when he sent the D away for repairs he did not intend to send her back during the currency of the policy.

Held, that the taking of the houseboat to the yard was authorised by the docking clause in the policy, and therefore the vessel was covered when the loss occurred and was lost through a peril of the sea. The further question whether the respondent had not at the time of the loss abandoned the insured adventure was answered in the negative.

Decision of Court of Appeal (1920, 1 K.B. 447) affirmed.

Appeal by the defendant from a judgment of the Court of Appeal allowing a claim by the plaintiff in respect of the loss of his houseboat “The

Dorothy" under a Lloyd's policy issued by the defendant and other underwriters. The facts sufficiently appear from the headnote. After consideration their lordships dismissed the appeal.

Lord BIRKENHEAD, L.C., after stating the facts, said that it was contended on behalf of the appellants: first, that there was no clear finding of fact that the cause of the casualty was the unusual height of the breast wave, or indeed that the breast wave was unusually high, and further that if there was such finding there was no evidence upon which it could properly be found. In his opinion these contentions failed. The question which arose upon these facts and upon the submissions of the parties which survived the argument were (1) was the loss caused by a peril insured against, (2) was the "Dorothy" covered by the policy during the shifting from her anchorage to Camper & Nicholson's yard for the purpose of docking and being put on the gridirons, and (3) had the insured adventure been abandoned? His lordship referred to the terms of the policy. The instrument was for six months ending the 14th January, 1919, for £400 on hull and material, machinery and boilers of the vessel "Dorothy" whilst anchored in a creek off Netley, however employed, with liberty to shift. The words quoted were typed at the beginning of the printed form, while at its foot was stamped a short clause to the following effect: "Including all risk of docking, undocking, changing docks and going on gridirons or graving docks as may be required during the currency of this policy." The perils insured against were perils usual in a Lloyd's policy, including perils of the seas. There were concurrent findings of fact in the courts below to the effect that the unusual size of the breast wave either caused the entry of the sea water or effectually contributed to its entry and his lordship saw no reason for differing from those findings. In his opinion this wave constituted a "sea peril." The elements which were necessary to form a sea peril had been frequently explained in this House. In the Marine Insurance Act the term "perils of the seas" referred only to fortuitous accidents or casualties of the seas, and did not include ordinary action of winds or waves. The incidence and dimensions of the wave in question amounted to a fortuitous casualty of the seas and were not accounted for merely by the ordinary action of winds and waves. Therefore in his opinion the loss was caused by a peril insured against. Then it was contended that the "Dorothy" was only protected whilst anchored in a creek off Netley; that there was a deviation; and that she was unprotected at the moment of the casualty. He thought that the words "with liberty to shift" were to be construed as an extension of the scope of the policy which would otherwise only protect the vessel while she was actually anchored in the creek. If the freedom to shift had not been stipulated for, the vessel would have been unprotected during all movements which circumstances might from time to time have required. But he did not think the words were intended to cover a voyage of some seven or eight miles to a different part of the coast. But the docking clause raised quite different considerations, and no reasonable meaning could be given to it unless it was construed as extending the protection to the course of a voyage to a dock or gridiron such as a reasonable owner might be justified in employing. The only remaining point was the contention of the appellant that the insured adventure had been abandoned. The respondent in his evidence said that it was his intention to spend the winter living on board the "Dorothy" at Northam, thereby (so it was claimed) abandoning altogether his anchorage in a "creek off Netley." It was sufficient to observe that such an intention was never communicated to the insurers, and that it was extremely improbable that he would have reached, without any consideration whatever, a decision which might conceivably have deprived him of the protection which in certain contingencies he might still need and for which he was bound to pay. The appeal failed on every ground.

Lords HALDANE, FINLAY, CAVE and SUMNER agreed in the appeal being dismissed. COUNSEL for the appellant: R. A. Wright, K.C., and Simey; for the respondent, D. C. Leck, K.C., and L. C. Thomas. SOLICITORS, William A. Crump & Son; Constant & Constant.

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

Court of Appeal.

HAYDOCK v. GOODIER. No. 1. 7th February.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—ACCIDENT—SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTED CLAIM—CONSENT AWARD—PAYMENT OF LUMP SUM—APPLICATION FOR WAR ADDITION—WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906 (6 Edw. VII, c. 58), SCHEDULE I (17)—WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION (WAR ADDITION) ACTS, 1917 AND 1919 (7 & 8 Geo. V, c. 42, and 9 & 10 Geo. V, c. 83).

A workman having claimed compensation for injury by accident, his employers disputed the claim and made no weekly payment. Eventually it was compromised by payment of a lump sum and costs in full settlement of all claims under the Act, the Judge at the request of the parties making an award by consent. At a later date the workman, being then totally incapacitated, applied for the additional weekly payments of 5s. and 15s. a week under the Workmen's Compensation (War Addition) Acts, 1917 and 1919, and the county court judge made an award in his favour.

Held, that he had no jurisdiction to do so, the claim having been compromised before any weekly payment had been made. The "War Addition" can only be added to an existing or redeemed weekly payment.

Ryan v. Hartley, 1912, 2 K.B. 150, applied.

Appeal by employers from an award of the County Court Judge at Preston. The applicant, a carter in the employment of the respondents,

injured his arm by accident arising out of his employment in August 1919. The employers did not admit liability and made no weekly payment. In November, 1919, the workman filed an application for compensation, the employers replying that the incapacity the workman was under was not due to the effects of the accident. On 16th December, 1919, when the case came on, the parties agreed to a settlement, the employers paying and the workman receiving £150 and agreed costs in full settlement of all claims for the injury, and the Judge making an award by consent. At that time the workman believed that the injury to his arm was temporary, and that he would recover in a few months, but he later found that his incapacity was probably permanent. In July, 1920, he filed an application claiming 5s. a week from the date of the accident to the end of 1919, and 15s. a week as from 1st January, 1920, under the Workmen's Compensation (War Addition) Acts, 1917 and 1919. The Judge, with some hesitation, awarded the sums asked for. The employers appealed.

The Court allowed the appeal.

Lord STERNDAL, M.R., in giving judgment, said that the case arose in somewhat peculiar circumstances. The arguments had travelled over a considerable ground, much of which lay outside the point at issue, which was covered by decisions of that Court. Therefore, the respondents' counsel's arguments must be addressed to the House of Lords, if they were to succeed. The applicant, a workman, alleged that he had met with injury by accident in the employment of the respondents and filed a request for arbitration on 14th August, 1919. The respondents alleged in their reply that any incapacity for work from which he was suffering was not the result of the accident, and so they did not admit their liability. However, the parties approached one another, but no weekly payment was ever made or even discussed between them. They came to an agreement in full settlement and asked the county court judge to make an award embodying that agreement. It was said that he was asked to make an order for the redemption of a weekly payment. He had not done so and he (his lordship) had the gravest doubt whether he had any power to do so. The learned judge expressed doubts about his jurisdiction to make the award and he (his lordship) shared those doubts. The jurisdiction was to award a weekly payment or to redeem a weekly payment. He could have recorded a memorandum of the agreement, but that did not give him jurisdiction to make an award such as was made here. But even if the award was not a good award, it contained conclusive evidence of an agreement between the parties to pay and receive £150 "in full settlement of all claims." That, it might be assumed, meant all claims under the Workmen's Compensation Act or Acts, apart from common law or any other statute. It had been decided by the Court of Appeal in a series of cases, beginning with *Ryan v. Hartley* ([1912], 2 K.B., 150) and ending with *Williams v. Minister of Munitions* (88 L.J.K.B., 1103), that such an agreement was a perfectly valid agreement. It had also been decided that such an agreement must be taken to be made under the provisions of the Act, and could therefore be recorded, *Rawlings v. Hodgson* (11 B.W.C.C., 73). It was said that the man at the time he entered into the agreement—though the statement was not in evidence—thought the injury was not likely to cause permanent incapacity, and one of the points raised was that the award on the face of it did not express what the parties really intended, viz., a full settlement of all claims arising during partial incapacity only.

No such point was taken in the Court below, and could, therefore, not be taken there. Total incapacity having supervened, a further application was made under the Workmen's Compensation (War Addition) Acts, 1917 and 1919, the former of which Acts (but not the latter) was in force at the date when the award was made. By the Workmen's Compensation (War Addition) Act, 1917, it was provided, s. 1 (1): "Where any workman is at any time during the period for which this Act continues in force entitled during total incapacity to a weekly payment by way of compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, he shall, whether the incapacity arose before or after the commencement of this Act, be entitled to receive from the person liable to pay the compensation by way of addition to each such weekly payment payable in respect of any week within the said period, a sum equal to one-fourth of the amount of that payment. (2) The additional weekly sum payable under this Act shall be deemed to be part of the weekly payment under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906 . . . and shall, notwithstanding that the liability to make the said weekly payment is redeemed subsequently to the commencement of this Act, continue to be payable in the same manner, as if that liability had not been redeemed." The Act of 1919 simply increased the amount of the addition. The sole question to be decided was: Was the order an order for the redemption of a weekly payment? If it was, the later Acts would seem to apply, but if it were not a redemption, but a compromise of a claim, there was no weekly payment to which the workman was entitled within the Act of 1917. It had been decided, and it was perfectly clear that there could be no redemption of a weekly payment, unless there was a weekly payment to redeem. That was well stated by the late Master of the Rolls in *Rawlings v. Hodgson* (*supra*), at p. 80. "It is unnecessary to come to the Court; it is unnecessary to wait until an agreement to pay a lump sum has been in operation for six months; the parties may agree, but there must be first an agreement as to the weekly payment. There must, however, be consent as to what is to be redeemed before you arrive at the lump sum which is to be payable in its place." It was perfectly obvious that the award made in the present case was not an order for redemption, but an order for the settlement of all liability. On the hearing of the application, the learned county court judge was clearly of that opinion at first, but he came to a different conclusion after

reserving his judgment. He then found that the applicant was totally incapacitated, and made an order "to redeem the contingent liability of the employer." It seemed to him (his lordship) that the learned judge did not then make, and could not make, an order to redeem a weekly payment. There was no power to be found in the Act to redeem a contingent liability, but the parties had power to agree to compromise a contingent liability. The learned judge said that the order he made must have been an order for redemption, as he had no power in the circumstances to make any other. He (his lordship) thought that the award for payment under the Acts of 1917 and 1919 was wrong. It had been decided that a man could enter into a binding agreement such as the present. It was by no means clear that a 3, which dealt with contracting out of the Act, had any application at all; it was not intended to prevent the compromise of a contingent liability arising under the Act. The parties contracted not out of the Act, but out of any liability extending beyond a certain ascertained liability. The workman in the present case did not fulfil the condition which he must fulfil in order to get any further compensation under the Acts of 1917 and 1919. For those reasons, he (his lordship) thought the learned judge's decision was wrong, and the appeal would be allowed.

SCUTTON, L.J., and YOUNGER, L.J., delivered judgment to the same effect, the former observing that he did not regard his judgment as satisfactory, as the Act was obscure on the point, and the Court was bound by its previous decisions.—COUNSEL, *Shakespeare and Lustgarten*; *Compston*, K.C., and *C. L. J. Holt*. SOLICITORS, *Ponsford & Devenish*, for *Peace & Darlington*, Liverpool; *A. T. Plant & Co.* for *Smith & Fazakerley*, Preston.

[Reported by H. LANGFORD LEWIS, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Chancery Division.

In re WELSH HOSPITAL (NETLEY) FUND: THOMAS v. THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL. P. O. LAWRENCE, J. 22nd February.

CHARITY—HOSPITAL FOR SICK AND WOUNDED SOLDIERS—HOSPITAL CLOSED—SURPLUS FUNDS—GENERAL INTENTION OF CHARITY—CY-PRÉS DOCTRINE.

Where a hospital was erected by voluntary donations and subscriptions for the benefit of sick and wounded Welsh soldiers in 1914, and closed in 1919, and a surplus left in the hands of the trustees thereof.

Held, that there was no resulting trust of such surplus for the subscribers, but that there was a fund devoted to charity as to which the cy-prés doctrine could be applied and a scheme brought in.

In re British Red Cross Balham Fund (1914, 2 Ch. 419) distinguished.

In 1914 voluntary donations and subscriptions were provided by Welshmen, and a hospital erected at Netley, and equipped and maintained out of donations and subscriptions from the same source for the benefit of sick and wounded Welsh soldiers. The hospital was closed down in 1919, the building sold, and the staff disbanded, and there remained a surplus of some £9,000 in the hands of the trustees of the hospital. It was proposed by these trustees that this surplus should be applied for establishing scholarships in the University of Wales for the encouragement of the study of medicine and surgery by persons of Welsh nationality, and they asked for the directions of the court to be at liberty so to apply it, there being a question as to whether there was a resulting trust for the subscribers, or whether the fund was devoted to charity, and the cy-prés doctrine might be applied and a scheme brought in on behalf of the Attorney-General. It was submitted that there was a good charitable intent and that the fund could be applied cy-prés on behalf of the subscribers. It was argued that there was a resulting trust for them in the events which had happened, and alternatively that the fund must be applied for sick and wounded Welsh soldiers.

P. O. LAWRENCE, J., after stating the facts, said: I find on the evidence that the fund is devoted to charity, and I hold that the cy-prés doctrine applies. There must accordingly be a reference to chambers to settle a scheme. The case of *In re British Red Cross Balkan Fund* (*supra*) that has been cited is distinguishable. There it was admitted that there was a resulting trust, and the only question for decision was how the fund was to be distributed among the subscribers. The scheme proposed by the trustees is within the purview of the charity, but the Attorney-General will consider whether a scheme nearer to the main objects of the charity can be devised. COUNSEL: *Owen Thompson*, K.C., & *W. J. Whitaker*; *A. Adam*; *Danckwerts*; *Wilfrid Greene*. SOLICITORS: *Wrenmore & Son*; *The Treasury Solicitor*.

[Reported by L. M. MAY, Barrister-at-Law.]

Mr. A. B. D. Lang read a paper on the 7th inst. before the Surveyors' Institution on "The report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on business premises." He suggested that the Institution should appoint a committee to draft a Bill giving such protection as may be considered necessary to tenants, subject to adequate safeguards for owners; and that a campaign be initiated to educate the public on the difficulties and dangers of upsetting the natural law of supply and demand. Three points in the report which inspired him with great alarm were (1) tribunals; (2) compensation for improvements; (3) compensation for goodwill.

In Parliament.

Bills Presented and in Progress.

In the House of Commons, the Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Act (1907) Amendment Bill—"to amend the Law relating to marriage with a deceased brother's widow," presented by Mr. Rendall (16th March) (Bill 46).

The Public Health (Tuberculosis) Bill—"to make further provision with respect to arrangements by local authorities for the treatment of tuberculosis," presented by Dr. Addison (16th March) (Bill 47).

In the House of Lords:—

The Law of Property Bill, read a Second time, and committed to a Committee of the whole House (17th March).

The Agriculture (Amendment) Bill, debate on Second reading commenced and adjourned (17th March).

In the House of Commons:—

The Coal Mines (Decontrol) Bill, read the Third time, and passed (17th March).

The German Reparation (Recovery) Bill, read the Third time, and passed (18th March).

Questions.

EUROPEANS (DIVORCE DECREES).

Sir J. D. REES (Nottingham, East) asked the Secretary of State for India what action he proposes to take in view of the decision recently affirmed by the Courts to the effect that divorce granted by the Indian High Courts to Europeans not technically domiciled in India are invalid in this country?

Mr. MONTAGU: It is proposed to ask Parliament to pass a validating Act, and the necessary steps will be taken with the least possible delay.

(17th March.)

PRE-WAR DEBTS.

Captain TERRELL (Henley) asked the Prime Minister the total amount collected from our German debtors and the total amount that has been paid over to Germany from debtor firms in England?

Sir P. LLOYD-GREAME: I have been asked to reply to this question. I assume that it refers to the payment of pre-war debts as defined by Section III of Part X of the Treaty of Versailles. Up to the end of February the total amount of the debts admitted by the German Clearing Office and paid to British creditors through the British Clearing Office is £17,384,233 0s. 3d. No amounts have been paid over to Germany by British debtors, but debts owing by the latter to the amount of £4,262,674 0s. 1d. have been admitted and credited to the German Clearing Office in account up to the end of last month.

(17th March.)

COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

Sir J. D. REES (Nottingham, East) asked the Prime Minister whether the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague is still in existence; and whether the spheres of jurisdiction or influence of that body and of the Court of International Justice of the League of Nations have been, will be, or can be defined?

Mr. HARMSWORTH: The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The spheres of the two Courts have not been expressly defined, but the Statute of the new Court provides that it shall be additional to the old. The absorption of the old Court by the new can only be a matter of slow development; joint working is, however, provided for.

(17th March.)

RENT RESTRICTION: SUB-LETTING.

Sir H. NIELD (Ealing) asked the Minister of Health whether he is aware that the expression, lawfully sub-let, in s. 3 (3) of s. 15 of the Increase of Rent and Mortgage Interest (Restrictions) Act, 1920, has reference only to the power of a tenant to sub-let under the terms of his own tenancy, and does not concern the terms of the sub-tenancy which are by this Act made binding upon the landlord and may be such as to inflict very considerable hardship upon him and render him liable to be the victim of a fraudulent bargain between tenant and sub-tenant; and whether, to prevent a continuance of such practices, he will reconsider the matter and introduce a short measure to amend the Act and correct other defects therein which judicial decisions have made clear?

Dr. ADDISON: I am advised that such cases as those referred to can only arise where the landlord has omitted to require from the tenant the usual covenant not to sub-let without his consent. As I have previously informed my hon. and learned friend, I cannot undertake to introduce further legislation on this subject.

(18th March.)

CENTRAL CONTROL BOARD (LIQUOR TRAFFIC).

Sir J. D. REES (Nottingham, East) asked the Prime Minister whether in view of the fact that beer as well as whisky has been allowed to be a

medicine in prohibitionist America, he will arrange to relax the restrictions imposed upon the people of the United Kingdom under the Defence of the Realm Act and Central Control Board (Liquor Traffic)?

Lieut.-Colonel BELL (Devizes) asked the Prime Minister if he is aware that the whole of the county of Wilts remains a scheduled area under the Regulations of the Central Control Board (Liquor Traffic), while the adjacent portion of the counties of Somerset, Berkshire, and Gloucestershire are unscheduled, and this although they are localities of exactly similar character to the adjoining district of Wiltshire, and any special reasons that may have existed for making Wiltshire a scheduled area have long since ceased to exist; if he is aware that very great feeling about this discrimination exists in Wiltshire among all classes of the population; and if he will prevail upon the Central Control Board (Liquor Traffic) to remove the county of Wilts from the list of scheduled areas?

The PRIME MINISTER: The Government propose to deal with this subject at an early opportunity. (21st March.)

INCREASE OF RENT ACT.

Mr. GILBERT (Southwark, Central) asked the Prime Minister whether, in view of the great amount of unemployment at present existing in the country, the Government propose to take any steps to postpone the further 10 per cent increase of rent allowed by the Increase of Rent Act of last year which comes into force in July; whether he is aware that the intention of the Act was that landlords should generally repair and restore houses occupied by tenants when rent increases were put into force; that very little repairs have been done to ordinary tenement property; and whether, in view of this fact, the Government will favourably consider as to postponing all further rent increases allowed for this year?

The MINISTER OF HEALTH (Dr. Addison): I am afraid that I cannot add anything to the replies which I gave on the 15th and 16th instant to questions asked by the hon. members for Bedwellty and Smethwick on this subject. I am sending my hon. friend copies of these replies.

Mr. HINDS (Carmarthen) asked the Minister of Health whether any legal proceedings have been instituted under clause 8 of the Increase of Rent and Mortgage Interest (Restrictions) Act?

Dr. ADDISON: It does not fall to my Department to institute legal proceedings under the Rent Restriction Act, but I understand that a case under the section to which my hon. friend refers was before the High Court last week. (21st March.)

PERMANENT COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

Lord ROBERT CEIL (Hitchin) asked the Prime Minister whether the convention for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice has yet been ratified by His Majesty; what other countries have ratified; and whether the Government will use their best efforts to secure early ratification by twenty-four States so that the convention may come into force and the Assembly of the League may be able to proceed to the election of judges next September?

The UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. Cecil Harmsworth): Steps are being taken for early ratification by His Majesty's Government of the Protocol establishing the Permanent Court of International Justice. So far, Sweden is the only country whose ratification has been notified to His Majesty's Government. The Council of the League has urged all Governments invited to sign the Protocol to give their signature and ratification without delay. The Secretary-General of the League has, moreover, been authorised to take steps if necessary on or after 1st April for obtaining a conditional nomination of candidates if the Statute has not been ratified at that date by twenty-four members of the League. (21st March.)

Societies.

Sheffield District Incorporated Law Society.

At the Forty-sixth Annual General Meeting of this Society, held in the Society's Library, Hoole's Chambers, Bank Street, Sheffield, on Thursday, the 24th February, at 3.30 p.m., Mr. J. P. Russell, President, in the chair, the notice convening the meeting, and the Committee's Report, as printed and circulated, were taken as read.

On the motion of the President, seconded by Mr. J. H. Davidson, the Forty-sixth Annual Report presented by the Committee was received, confirmed and adopted, and the accounts of the Hon. Treasurer for the past year, as audited by the Society's professional auditors, were approved and passed.

A resolution was passed expressing the cordial thanks of the Society to Mr. J. P. Russell, the President, and appreciation of the ability with which he had filled the office and the consideration he had given to his duties during the past year. Resolutions were also passed expressing the best thanks of the Society to the Hon. Treasurer and the Hon. Secretaries for their services during the past year.

The President then presented to Mr. Bramley a silver vase which had been subscribed for by the members of the Society as a testimonial on the occasion of his resigning the office of Hon. Secretary. The vase, which was a replica of the famous Warwick vase, standing in the grounds of Warwick Castle, was inscribed as follows:—

"Presented to Edward Bramley, M.A., by his fellow members of the Sheffield District Incorporated Law Society as a mark of esteem and in recognition of his valuable work as Hon. Secretary from 1897—1921."

The President, addressing Mr. Bramley, referred to the great services which he had rendered to the Society, and tendered to him, in the name of all the members, their best wishes for his future welfare and happiness. Mr. G. E. Branson, seconded, and Mr. Bramley replied, thanking the members for their presentation, which, he said, would always be of very great value to him as a token of their appreciation.

The following gentlemen were elected as officers for the ensuing year: President, Mr. Albert Howe; Vice-President, Mr. Claude Barker; Hon. Treasurer, Mr. P. K. Wake; Hon. Secretary, Mr. C. S. Coombe; Committee, Messrs. H. S. Barker, H. Bedford, Frank Bowman, Edward Bramley, S. H. Clay, L. J. Clegg, L. E. Emmet, A. S. Fawcett, C. L. dea Forges (Rotherham), T. A. Gainsford, Charles Hodgkinson (Penistone), William Irons, W. A. Lambert, A. E. C. Ludlam, J. H. Pawson (Doncaster), H. Reed, J. P. Russell, G. E. Smith, W. M. Smith, C. R. Wilson, and J. E. Wing.

The President then presented the Society's prize for the year to Mr. D. S. Branson, M.A., who passed the Law Society's final examination in 1920 with first class honours. The President, referring to Mr. Branson's distinguished Army service with the Hallamshires from August 1914 until after the Armistice, during which period he attained to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, was twice seriously wounded, five times mentioned in despatches, was awarded the M.C. and D.S.O. with two bars, said that, taken in conjunction with his present success, it constituted a very remarkable record.

The following gentlemen were appointed as the Society's representatives to act on the Joint Council of the Society and the Sheffield and District Law Clerks' Society: Messrs. H. Bedford, E. Bramley, S. H. Clay, G. Denton, L. E. Emmet, H. Reed, and B. A. Wightman.

Authority was given to the Committee to dispose of the balance of the Society's War Memorial Fund, by contributing it or such part of it as they might think fit to the York & Lancaster Sheffield War Memorial Fund.

The question of the increased telephone charges came before the meeting in connection with a recommendation from the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce that "direct action" should be taken by telephone subscribers by refusing to sign the new telephone agreements until after investigation and approval of the proposed increases by Parliament. After some discussion, during which it was pointed out that the matter had since been raised in Parliament and an enquiry promised, it was resolved that no action be taken.

The date of the next Annual General Meeting was fixed for Thursday, the 23rd February, 1922.

[We must hold over extracts from the Report of the Committee.]

United Law Society.

A joint debate with the University of London Law Students' Society was held at University College, Gower Street, on Monday, 7th March. The President of the University of London Law Students' Society in the chair.

Mr. G. S. Herbert moved: "That this house is in favour of the codification of the English law."

Mr. G. W. Fisher opposed.

There also spoke Messrs. Bowles, Godwin, Redfern, Casey, Neville Tebbutt, Blake and Bairauman.

The motion was put to the house and carried by three votes.

United Law Society.

A meeting was held in The Middle Temple Common Room, on Monday, 21st March, Mr. H. S. Wood-Smith in the chair. Mr. Neville Tebbutt proposed and Mr. H. V. Rabagliati seconded the following motion, which was carried *sem con.*:—"That the Earl of Reading be elected a Vice-President of the United Law Society."

Mr. C. E. Jones moved:—"That the case of *Raudings v. General Trading Company* (1921, W.N. 23) was wrongly decided."

Mr. H. Norman S. Heath opposed.

There also spoke Messrs. J. Horniman, H. J. Casey, H. V. Rabagliati, Neville Tebbutt, S. E. Redfern, W. Rowan Hodge, J. F. W. Weigall and G. P. Boon.

The motion was put to the House and lost by seven votes.

Companies.

Britannic Assurance Company, Limited.

The Directors' Report for the year ending 31st December, 1920, received and adopted at the 55th Annual General Meeting of the Company held on Friday, 11th March, 1921, at the Chief Offices, Broad Street Corner, Birmingham, after referring to the great loss sustained by the death on the 15th November last, of the late Chairman, Mr. Fredk. T. Jefferson, J.P., who during a period of 27 years had rendered invaluable services to the Company, states that to fill the above and other vacancies on the Board, the Directors,

elected as Chairman of Directors, Mr. Joseph A. Patrick, J.P., as Vice-Chairman of Directors, Mr. Jno. A. Jefferson in addition to continuing his duties as General Manager and, as Directors, subject to the confirmation of the meeting follow the three gentlemen, whose association with the Company is well known: Mr. J. Murray Laing, Mr. A. M. Patrick and Mr. W. Roscoe. Mr. J. Murray Laing will still act as Secretary and Actuary.

Premium Income.—The Premium Income in respect of Life Assurance for the year ended 31st December, 1920, amounted to £2,180,447, showing the substantial increase of £321,932 over the previous year. The total Premium Income amounted to £2,185,202.

Claims.—The sum paid in Claims during the year amounted to £810,959, including £251,450 paid under Maturing Policies.

Total Claims Paid.—The total amount paid in Claims by the Company up to the 31st December, 1920, was £14,981,213.

Ordinary Branch.—The Premium Income for the year in Ordinary Branch amounted to £459,397, showing an increase of £76,867 over the previous year. The Claims paid in this branch during the year amounted to £217,878 inclusive of surrenders. The number of Policies issued in this branch (including Policies under the Special Tables) was 15,087, assuring the sum of £1,943,222 at an annual premium of £101,504 and single premiums of £1,438.

Industrial Branch.—The Premium Income in the Industrial Branch amounted to £1,721,050, showing an increase of £245,065 over the previous year. The Claims paid during the year in this branch amounted to £587,435 inclusive of surrenders.

Total Income and Expenditure.—The Gross Income from all sources amounted to £2,470,124, being an increase of £355,844 over the Gross Income of the previous year. The Total Outgo, inclusive of £101,678, written off Stock Exchange and other securities, etc., amounted to £1,891,780, leaving a Balance of Income over Expenditure on the year's accounts of £578,344.

Annual Valuation.—The Annual Valuation of the Company's business has been made by the Actuary, Mr. J. Murray Laing, F.I.A., F.F.A. After making full provision for all policy liabilities on the same bases of Mortality and Interest as those adopted in the previous year, with certain necessary strengthening of margins for future expenses, the resulting surplus is £150,854, out of which the Directors recommend that £15,000 be added to the Staff Pension Fund, bringing that fund up to £65,000. They also recommend that out of the remaining surplus the amount of £79,692 be declared as divisible amongst the participating Policyholders in the Ordinary Branch and the Shareholders, the balance being carried forward unappropriated.

Lord Finlay on Legal Education.

Lord Finlay, who was the chief guest at a reception which the members of the teaching staff of the Law Society held for past and present students in the Common Room of the Society on 11th March, Sir Walter Trower presiding, in the course of an address said he was happy to bear testimony to the admirable work that had been done by their chairman in the cause of legal education. Coming among so many young people, his thoughts were carried back to his own student days. He thought that the effort of every student should be not to be a mere lawyer. He would be all the better lawyer if he was something else besides. He felt sometimes he had outlived the generation which could find pleasure in reading the works of Sir Walter Scott, but he would inflict upon them a quotation from one of the novels of that once popular writer. In "Guy Mannering" a very distinguished and amusing lawyer, Mr. Pleydell, was introduced. Colonel Mannering, who went to his house on some legal business affecting his ward, was shown into the library, where he found a great stock of books, including the best editions of all the best authors, and particularly an admirable collection of the classics. Mr. Pleydell said to him: "These are my tools of trade. A lawyer without history or literature is a mechanic, a mere working mason. If he possesses some knowledge of these he may venture to call himself an architect." These were words of wisdom from one who was not merely the greatest of all novelists, but also a member of the legal profession. When he was a boy he heard Lord Brougham speak. Lord Brougham was very fond of mixing law with something of somewhat lighter consistency, and he said he was sorry to tell them that many of his friends at the Bar used to read nothing but the newspaper, apart from law, and that some of them did not even read the newspapers. He would very earnestly say to all who were still in *statu pupillari*, "Do not think the time wasted that you may give to general literature. It is not wasted. You will not make yourself a better lawyer by confining yourself to law."

In England, continued Lord Finlay, there was a great variety of legal instruction, and in London itself there were two principal sources of instruction. They had the Inns of Court and they had also the Law Society, with its school of law. The Inns of Court had played some part in history. The account of the life there in the time of James I in "The Fortunes of Nigel" would be remembered. They might remember the even more charming account of the Inns of Court given in Thackeray's novel of "Pendennis" in more recent times. All of them were proud of the Inns of Court. There was, however, one direction in which he thought the Inns of Court might have done a little more. The Law Society had done a great work in the matter of legal education. The progress made had been enormous, and they all recognised that the facilities for a thorough training of students in connection with the Law Society were admirable and deserved the attention of all who were interested in the great subject

of the study of the law. Why should not the Inns of Court and the Law Society combine for the purpose of setting up a great School of Law worthy of the country and worthy of the Empire? Excellent work was done at the Inns of Court, and excellent work was done by the Law Society, but, after all, union was strength, and he thought that a greater school of law than either, taken by itself, might be established if they could combine their forces. When he was Attorney-General he took a great deal of interest in the subject, and a very considerable sum of money happening to be available by the sale of one of the Inns for the purposes of legal education, he had hoped that a School might have been founded. That scheme, unfortunately, miscarried. He trusted that the proposal might be renewed, and he believed it might be a little better understood now than it was then. It did not at all mean the fusion of the two branches of the profession. In Scotland there was the same division of the legal profession into advocates and solicitors, but all students of either branch attended the same classes in the Universities, and one of its advantages was that the system, with its large classes, tended to create that enthusiasm which every teacher wished in his pupils. Why could not something of that kind be introduced here?

Sir Walter Trower, after expressing his great regret that the President could not be present owing to a serious accident, proposed a vote of thanks to Lord Finlay, who, he said, was a lawyer of international fame. He was as much at home in New York or at The Hague as he was when presiding at the Privy Council. He had spoken of a National School of Law, and he (Sir Walter Trower) had had the pleasure of working with him with that object when he was Attorney-General in 1909. He hoped that all present would do their utmost in co-operating with those who were endeavouring to promote a national, or rather an Imperial, school of law worthy of the Empire. We had in this country an Imperial Court in the Privy Council, and surely it was desirable to have a School corresponding with the duties and the influence of that great tribunal.

The late Lord Moulton.

At the sitting of the House of Lords for judicial business on Thursday, the 10th inst., the Lord Chancellor, in the course of an address on the services rendered by the late Lord Moulton, said: "My Lords, the judge who has died was a very remarkable figure in our national life. There never was a moment in his strenuous career, from the moment when he reached manhood, in which it would have been possible to doubt that he was destined for the highest distinction in almost any career which he might undertake. All are aware of the extraordinary promise of his University career, and when that career was crowned by a Fellowship at a Cambridge College, it would have been as easy to predict a striking and brilliant progress in science or commerce as at the Bar. Lord Moulton had been a judge for some years when the war broke out. The part which he played in the war has been little understood by the great body of his countrymen. I have had the opportunity of receiving enlightenment on this point by many discussions with men of the first position in science who served under him in various capacities at the Ministry of Munitions, and, my Lords, I choose my language carefully when I say that I greatly doubt whether it would have been possible for this war to have been brought to a successful conclusion at the period when it was so brought, if it had not been for the direct and constant personal contribution which the late Lord Moulton made. It must indeed, my Lords, be a unique event in the history of the judiciary of any country, in the career of any individual member of the Bench of any country, that it can be said without exaggeration of such a judge that by sheer intellectual force, by the dynamic impulse of his own personality, he should have played so supreme a part in what at first would appear to be a purely military result. My Lords, it is to me a subject of melancholy reflection that a week ago Lord Moulton came to see me for the purpose of discussing certain judicial business in my room. I had not seen him for some time, and I congratulated him upon having attained, apparently in the full possession of his health, the fifteenth year of his tenure of judicial office. He told me then that it was his hope and his belief that his physical powers would enable him to contribute for some years yet to the discussions in this House. A week later, in one swift but painless moment, he was carried away, and that incomparable brain was still. My Lords, we are all of us concerned that his death should be marked by an expression, made in this House which he adorned, of profound regret at the loss of a brilliant judge, a loyal colleague, and a valued friend."

Dinner to Sir R. Linthorne, O.B.E.

Sir Richard R. Linthorne, O.B.E., Town Clerk of Southampton, says *The Southern Daily Echo*, was the guest of honour at a dinner given by the members of the legal profession in Southampton and neighbourhood at the Dolphin Hotel, on the night of the 18th inst., in recognition of the knighthood recently conferred upon him. The Mayor (Councillor H. Blatch, J.P., himself a solicitor) was in the chair, and there was a large gathering of local legal gentlemen. After the loyal toast, the Mayor rose to propose the toast of the evening. Legal gentlemen, he said, were supposed always to be fighting each other, and so they were professionally, but individually there was no better friend than a professional brother. Sir Richard and

himself has for the past 20 years fought shoulder to shoulder the battles of the Town Council, and very few people realised the intimacy between a Town Clerk and a Mayor who was also a member of the legal profession. Their Town Clerk had to run the Council on legal lines, and to see that things were done in order. He very often had 68 opposing parties, with widely divergent views, to deal with. It was the greatest possible help for the Mayor to have a Town Clerk like Sir Richard. The Mayor referred to Sir Richard's legal pupils, Mr. Wiltshire (Town Clerk of Birmingham), Mr. Sparks (Town Clerk of Portsmouth), Mr. McIlveen (clerk to the East Sussex County Council), and Mr. Bruce Penny (Town Clerk of Lambeth), all of whom had received their training at his hands.

When they realised that he had been Town Clerk for the last 22 years, they must realise that they had a man of no ordinary character. His honour was one given to a man to whom honour was due, and was an added honour to the profession and to the town. The toast was enthusiastically drunk, with musical honours.

Sir Richard Linthorne replied in a moving fashion. He said that he rose to return his very heartfelt thanks for their great kindness towards him. The Mayor had been a friend of his for many years, and he thanked him for the far too kind way in which he had proposed the toast, and those present for the way in which they had received it. He really did not know what to say, for he felt overwhelmed. It was difficult to answer such a toast, and he could not find words adequately to express his thanks to his professional brethren. Mr. H. K. Grierson, who confessed to being the oldest admitted practitioner in the room, proposed the health of the Chairman, who, in a brief reply, said that nothing gave him greater pleasure than to know that he had the goodwill of his professional brethren, and nothing in his Mayoralty had given or could give him greater pleasure than to preside at this dinner.

The Agriculture (Amendment) Bill.

The following is the text of this Bill which is intitled "An Act to explain proviso (4) to section twelve of the Agriculture Act, 1920, and the First Schedule to that Act so far as that Schedule amends sub-section (1) of section one of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1908, and the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1908, and to remove doubt as to the procedure in arbitrations as to rent under section ten of the Agriculture Act, 1920."

Be it enacted, &c.

1. *Explanation of certain provisions of Agriculture Act, 1920.*—(1) Where a demand in writing for arbitration as to the rent to be paid for a holding has been made for the purposes of section ten of the Agriculture Act, 1920 [10 & 11 Geo. 5, c. 76] (which relates to compensation for disturbance), and has been agreed to, whether in writing or otherwise, the question as to the rent shall be referred to arbitration under the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1908 [8 Edw. 7, c. 28].

(2) Proviso (4) to section twelve of the Agriculture Act, 1920 (which applies the provisions of that Act relating to compensation for disturbance to cottages on agricultural holdings), shall have effect, and be deemed always to have had effect, as though the words "recoverable summarily from the tenant" were therein substituted for the words "recoverable summarily by the tenant."

(3) The First Schedule to the Agriculture Act, 1920 (which sets out certain minor amendments to be made in the Agriculture Holdings Act, 1908), shall have effect, and be deemed always to have had effect, as though the words "In sub-section (1) after the words 'in this Act mentioned' there shall be inserted the words 'and, in a case where the contract of tenancy was made on or after the first day of January, nineteen hundred and twenty-one, then'" were therein substituted for the words "In sub-section (1) after the word 'Act,' where that word first occurs, there shall be inserted the words 'and the tenancy was entered upon after the first day of January, nineteen hundred and twenty-one.'"

2. *Short title and construction.*—(1) This Act may be cited as the Agriculture (Amendment) Act, 1921.

(2) This Act shall so far as it relates to England and Wales be construed as one with the Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1908 to 1920, and so far as it relates to Scotland be construed as one with the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Acts, 1908 to 1920, and this Act and those Acts respectively may be cited together as the Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1908 to 1921, or the Agricultural Holdings (Scotland) Acts, 1908 to 1921, as the case may be.

Law Students' Journal.

Law Students' Debating Society.

At a meeting of the Society held at the Law Society's Hall on Tuesday, 1st March, 1921 (Chairman, Mr. C. W. Bower), the subject for debate was: "That in the opinion of this House the recent refusal of organised labour to co-operate with the Government in an enquiry into the causes of unemployment with a view to the mitigation of that evil is a regrettable and unjustifiable attempt to exploit the misfortunes of the unemployed in the interests of a political party." Mr. G. B. Willis opened in the affirmative. Mr. D. E. Oliver opened in the negative. The following members also

spoke: Messrs. D. L. Strellett, Ivan Horniman, N. R. Fox-Andrews, J. F. Chadwick, T. Hatfield Greene, G. M. Barnes, and A. R. Clarke Williams. The motion was carried by three votes. There were 19 members present.

A joint meeting of the Society with the Chartered Secretaries Students Society was held at the Law Society's Hall on Tuesday, the 8th March, 1921 (Chairman, Mr. C. P. Blackwell), and the subject for debate was: "That the Companies Act, 1908, is in need of revision." Mr. F. W. Harris, of the Chartered Secretaries Students Society, opened in the affirmative. Mr. A. R. N. Powys, of the Law Students Debating Society, opened in the negative. The following members of the Chartered Secretaries Students Society also spoke: Miss Barrett and Messrs. H. E. Simpson and J. B. Stubbs. The following members of the Law Students Debating Society also spoke: Messrs. F. Burgis, J. F. Chadwick, A. E. Johnson, G. B. Willis, H. Baron and D. Nimmo. The opener having replied, the motion was carried by 13 votes. There were 19 members and 24 visitors present.

At a meeting of the Society held at the Law Society's Hall, on Tuesday, the 15th March, 1921 (Chairman, Mr. W. S. Jones), the subject for debate was: "That the case of *Thomas v. Jones* (1920, 2 K.B. 399) was wrongly decided." Mr. A. R. Clarke Williams opened in the affirmative. Mr. H. S. Baron seconded in the affirmative. Mr. G. M. Barnes opened in the negative. Mr. W. M. Pleadwell seconded in the negative. The following members also spoke: Messrs. Ivan Horniman, Peter Anderson, P. Quass, C. V. Packman and R. H. Hodge (visitor). The opener having replied, the motion was carried by two votes. There were 14 members and one visitor present.

The Law Society.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION.

The following candidates (whose names are in alphabetical order) were successful at the Preliminary Examination held on 23rd and 24th February, 1921:—

Barnes, Walter	Hockings, Thomas Dymond
Barnes, William Henry	Horley, Roy Engelbert
Berryman, Frederic Donald	Hutchings, Geoffrey Balfour
Bracher, Philip	Jenkins, Hugh
Bradley, Wilfrid Gray	Jones, Edward David Vaughan
Bull, George Rowland	Kearney, Leonard
Carpenter, Arthur Boville	Lowe, Herbert
Chellew, Philip James	McDonnell, Henry
Christophers, Francis Theodore	Mairs, Ernest
Coldham, Albert Sydney	Matthews, William George
Considine, Stanley George Ulick	Merkel, Henry Walter
Cook, Aubrey James	Moir, Anthony Forbes
Denny, Percy	Morgan, William Rowland
Dyer, Cecil Edward	Puntan, Campbell
Edwards, John Dudley	Reading, Bertram
Fogg, John	Shaw, Gilbert Everts
Fournier, Albert Edward	Slack, Norman Wade
Goldsmith, Joel Themans	Smith, James Frederick
Gosling, John Alford	Tuck, Albert Edward
Griffin, Frederick Wyndham	Waldy, Edward Garmondsway
Grindey, Harold	Walton, Cyril Thompson
Hamer, Thomas	Wills, Thomas Frederick
Harrison, Charles Benjamin	Woolley, William Leslie Paget
Yule, Thomas Christopher.	

No. of Candidates . . . 98 Passed . . . 47

Law Society's Hall,
Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2.,
11th March, 1921.

By Order of the Council,
E. R. COOK,
Secretary.

Obituary.

Mr. Frederick Walker.

A correspondent of *The Times* (17th inst.) writes:—

The death of Mr. Frederick Walker marks the passing of an exceptional personality. The son of a country parson, and originally a country solicitor, Mr. Walker first came into prominence in the City of London in connection with the reorganization of joint stock company finance nearly a generation ago. At that time he had the reputation of being something of a stormy petrel at company meetings, and was rather a terror to chairmen who had not been schooled in public life. In these earlier years he added to a gift of incisive criticism a dramatic eloquence which was apt to carry away his hearers and himself, and gave the impression of an aggressiveness which existed only on the surface. This was probably due to an Irish strain in his blood. Sufficiently Irish to be impetuous, he had also the Irish gifts of tenacity in friendship and pugnacity in debate. But he was not perverse. Few men were more open to reason. This characteristic was very noticeable when he became actively concerned in trust company administration. He was quick to appreciate essentials, while, at the same time, in the companies he directed with marked ability, he never grudged the closest attention to any detail.

Coming to London in middle life, almost an unknown man, to pursue his profession where there is much competition, he built up an important legal connection by sheer force of character and untiring industry, and found time also to serve the City for many years as a member of the Court of Common Council, where his interventions in debate were always effective.

Frederick Walker was a born fighter, and fearless in the expression of his opinions, whether they were popular or unpopular. He did not suffer fools gladly, and was no respecter of persons or offices. His utter carelessness about personal attire was significant of his marked individuality. He was a generous-minded man whose thoughts had a wide horizon. A great reader, with a distinct literary cast, a wonderful memory, and a lively sense of humour, his conversation was delightful.

Of his private life this is not the place to speak, beyond saying that his union with Mrs. Mary Vavasour Walker was a singularly happy one. He was a devoted father to his three children, and they were devoted to him. Those who knew him only as a formidable adversary would have been surprised by, and delighted with, the sweetness of his domestic life. He is mourned most by those who knew him best.

Legal News.

General.

We understand that one of the first of Messrs. Hampton & Sons' sales at the St. James' Estate Rooms, 20, St. James' Square, S.W., will be held on the 26th April next, when that very interesting historical house, "The Restoration House," Rochester, referred to in the histories of the county and visited by many eminent men, notably Charles Dickens and Pepps, will be offered. It was built in 1587 and named "The Restoration House," after the visit of King Charles II, 1660. The building itself is of red brick with fine timber roof and oak and stone mullioned windows. The house contains some wonderful oak carvings, panelled walls, Tudor and Adam fireplaces, a fine Elizabethan staircase, and an equally beautiful Jacobean staircase with twist banisters.

At the North London Police Court on the 5th inst., the Magistrate (Mr. Forbes Lankester) was asked to suspend an order for the maintenance of two children, pending an appeal. The Magistrate: The common law of this country is the essence of common sense. People say that it is not, but when judges do not know quite what the law is, they rely on common sense and are generally right. I took, in making the order, what I thought to be the common-sense view. Now I am asked to suspend the order until the High Court has time to hear the appeal, which may be months hence. If I complied, this woman would have no money for the children during that period, and they might starve. That is not common sense. The defendant must pay under this order or go to gaol.

At Hackney Coroner's Court on Saturday a verdict of "Wilful murder" was returned against Minnie Ethel Stark, 26, in respect of the death of her newly-born child found strangled with a silk cord in a cubicle at a Salvation Army Home at Clapton, where she had slept. The jury at first returned a majority verdict that the child died by strangulation but that there was not sufficient evidence to show whether at the time it was a fully-born child. The Coroner, however, advised reconsideration, and the jury then altered their verdict. The Coroner said that the first verdict would have been illogical. The difficulty arose through some absurd state of the law. It was pointed out by an Attorney-General as long ago as 1878 that a child might be damaged during birth, but if it died as a result of that damage, before actually born, not only was it not murder, but no crime at all. On the other hand, if a partly-born child was damaged and came into the world alive and then died, it was murder. Apparently the logic of it was that such a child as he had referred to was not a "person" in law until it had come into the world alive. That, he believed, was the law even now, but he should not be surprised if this particular inquest resulted in an alteration in the law.

VALUATIONS FOR INSURANCE.—It is very essential that all Policy Holders should have a detailed valuation of their effects. Property is generally very inadequately insured, and in case of loss insurers suffer accordingly. **DEBENHAM, STORR & SONS (LIMITED)**, 26, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2, the well-known valuers and chattel auctioneers (established over 100 years), have a staff of expert Valuers, and will be glad to advise those desiring valuations for any purpose. Jewels, plate, furs, furniture, works of art, bric-a-brac a speciality. —[ADVT.]

Winding-up Notices.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, MAR. 11.

TWILIGHT SLEEP NURSING HOMES LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Mar. 16, to send their names and addresses, and full particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederick Deves Pepper, 39, Victoria-st., S.W.1, liquidator.

W. H. ROBINSON & CO. LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Mar. 31, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Messrs. Alfred James Mair and Oliver Sunderland, 5 Frederick-st., Sunderland, liquidators.

SWEDISH CANADIAN LENDERS LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 20, to send in their names and addresses, particulars of their debts or claims, to Benjamin Thomas Norton, F.C.A., 9, Old Jewry-chmbrs., E.C.2, liquidator.

CORPORATE TRUSTEE & EXECUTOR.

THE ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE

ACTS AS

TRUSTEE of FUNDS amounting to

£30,000,000.

For Particulars apply to:

THE SECRETARY, HEAD OFFICE, ROYAL EXCHANGE, E.C.3.

THE MANAGER, LAW COURTS BUILDING, 29-30, HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.1.

THE TRUSTEE MANAGER, MANCHESTER BRANCH, 94-96, KING STREET.

A. J. LYTHER (1918) LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 21, to send in their names and addresses, with particulars of their debts or claims, to George Wilson Grimth, 57, Soho-rd., Handsworth, Birmingham, liquidator.

PICKETTS LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 20, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Duncan Frederick Baden, 73 Basinghall-st., liquidator.

MORVEN TRANSPORT CO. LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 26, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. Alfred Wright, 20, Conduit-st., W.1, liquidator.

THE JESMOND PAVILION (NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE) LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John A. Walbank, 34, Grey-st., Newcastle-upon-Tyne, liquidator.

THE NORFOLK COLD STORAGE & ICE MANUFACTURING CO. LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 15, to send their names and addresses, and full particulars of their debts or claims, to Fred S. Culey, 5, Bank-Place, Norwich, liquidator.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, MAR. 15.

J. LORD (M/C) LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Mar. 29, to send in their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. John Jackson Burne, 55, Cross-st., Manchester, liquidator.

KELMSCOTT, WILLIAMS & CO. LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 30, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. Harold Roberts, 133, Salisbury-sq., Fleet-st., liquidator.

COAL BY-PRODUCTS (PARENT) SYNDICATE LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Mar. 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Alfred Willie Bellman, 6, Martineau-rd., Highbury Hill, N.5, liquidator.

SERLEY CHEMICAL CO. LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before May 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. Wilfrid Smalles, Ocean-chmbrs., Lowgate, Kingston-upon-Hull, liquidator.

THE RAVEN ENGINEERING CO. LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 6, to send in their names and addresses, with particulars of their debts or claims, to Edgar Payne, Raven Works, Cross Green-ls., Leeds, liquidator.

ISAAC THORP & SONS LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 21, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Lawrence Lancelot Samuels, 7, Norfolk-st., Manchester, liquidator.

PICKETTS LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 20, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Duncan Frederick Baden, 73 Basinghall-st., liquidator.

ZEEHAN DUNDAS MINES LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 12, to send their names and addresses to Arthur David Fogg, 5, Bucklersbury, E.C., liquidator.

GRAMMO NOVELTY CO. LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Mar. 24, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Thomas Woodward, 19, Valletta-rd., Acton, W., liquidator.

ROYAL HOTEL DEAL LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 5, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Herbert Alexander McCann, 8, Queen-st., Chopside, liquidator.

SOUTHERN COMMERCIAL SUPPLIES LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before April 18, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Leonard Arthur Reddall, 1, Guildhall-chmbrs., Basinghall-st., E.C., liquidator.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, MAR. 15.

BLAKE V. GRIMSHAW & BLAKE.—David Grimshaw, Calverley, nr. Leeds. On or before May 2, to send by post prepaid, to Messrs. Warwick Williams & Marchant, 23, St. Swinith's-ls., Master A. Keen, at the Chambers of Mr. Justice Peterson, Room 237, Royal Courts.

COMMERCIAL BANK OF SCOTLAND LTD. V. CAMPBELL. Eric William Campbell, Jermyn Court Hotel, Piccadilly. On or before April 22, to send by post prepaid, to Mr. Llewellyn Wynn McLeod, 1, Lincoln's Inn-fields, W.C.2. Mr. Justice Peterson, Royal Courts.

PARKER V. SAUNDERS. William Nathaniel Saunders, Red Cedars, Durrington, Sussex. Horticulturalist, on or before April 5, to send by post prepaid, to Robert William Charles Worthing. Mr. Justice Eve and Mr. Justice Peterson, Royal Courts.

Resolutions for Winding-up Voluntarily.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, MAR. 11.

Colburheath Co. Ltd.

Boyd's Studios Ltd.

Hollyrood Construction Co. Ltd.

The Southampton Cold Stores Ltd.

The Ritchie Concrete Engineering & Ship-

building Co. Ltd.

Keeling's Oxides Ltd.

Duro Brushes Ltd.

Stuart & Dixon Ltd.

Robert Courtneidge Ltd.

A. H. Taylor (Springs) Ltd.

The Fairley Aviation Co. Ltd.

The Anglo Chemical & Colour Co. Ltd.

The Helston Valley Tin Co. Ltd.

J. H. Stone Ltd.

H. Edmunds & Co. Ltd.

M. C. Reynolds Propulsion Ltd.

Maliboda Tea Estate Ltd.

Picketts Ltd.

The Read-Westlake Co. Ltd.

Depford Steel & Iron Works Ltd.

Wolgate Ltd.

United Small Arms Ltd.

French Shale Syndicate Ltd.

The Yorkshire Pitwood Association Ltd.

The Tilbury Alhambra & Cinema Hall Ltd.

Rubber Curing Patents Syndicate Ltd.

The Carleton Manufacturing Co. Ltd.

The Sierra Leone Development Syndicate Ltd.

Samuel Hunt Junr. Ltd.

Joseph Gibson & Co. Ltd.

Gordon Laundries (Surrey) Ltd.

W. C. Powers & Co. Ltd.

John Waddington Ltd.

Wool & Produce Imports Co. Ltd.

The Limpley Stoke Hydropathic Co. Ltd.

Memo Lubricator Co. Ltd.

L. & C. Canteen Supplies Ltd.

Grimshy News Co. Ltd.

EQUITY AND LAW

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.2.

ESTABLISHED 1844.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman—Sir Richard Stephens Taylor.

James Austen-Cartmell, Esq.
Alexander Dingwall Bateson, Esq., K.C.
John George Butcher, Bart., K.C., M.P.
Edmund Church, Esq.
Philip G. Collins, Esq.
Harry Milton Crookenden, Esq.
John Croft Deverell, Esq.
Robert William Diddin, Esq.
Charles Baker Dimond, Esq.

Deputy-Chairman—L. W. North Hickey, Esq.

The Rt. Hon. Lord Ernie, P.C., M.V.O.
John Roger Burrow Gregory, Esq.
Archibald Herbert James, Esq.
Allan Ernest Messer, Esq.
Charles R. Rivington, Esq.
Mark Lemon Romer, Esq., K.C.
The Hon. Sir Charles Russell, Bart.
Francis Minchin Vowles, Esq., C.B.E.
Charles Wigan, Esq.

FUNDS EXCEED £5,000,000.

All classes of Life Assurance Granted. Whole Life and Endowment Assurances without profits, at exceptionally low rates of premium.

W. P. PHELPS, Manager.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, MAR. 15.

J. Lord (M/c) Ltd.
Lyford Steamship Co. Ltd.
A. B. Morley & Co. Ltd.
Warren Lambert Engineering Co. Ltd.
Phorundum Flame Carbons Ltd.
The Grimby Electric Welding Co. Ltd.
The Britannia Dry Dock Co. Ltd.
Zeehan Dundas Mines Ltd.
The North Londale Motor Co. Ltd.
Eaton & Griffiths Ltd.
John Shann Ltd.
Combined Symphony Orchestra Co. Ltd.
J. Lionel Barber & Co. Ltd.

Cellos Gold Leaf Manufacturing Co. Ltd.
The Frinton Steamship Co. Ltd.
The Chester Gallery Ltd.
Kilnscott, Williams & Co. Ltd.
Isaac Thorp & Sons Ltd.
Fakenham Corn Exchange & Public Rooms Co.
Grammo Novelty Co. Ltd.
St. Dunstan's Laundry Ltd.
The "United India" Co. Ltd.
The Wickham Field-works Ltd.
Mersey Electrical Engineering Co. Ltd.
St. James (Birmingham) Ltd.

Creditors' Notices.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, MAR. 8.

ANDERSON, THOMAS, Wallsend, Accountant. April 5. Cooper & Goodger, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
BARNETT, MRS. RACHAEL, Parkstone, Dorset. Mar. 31. D'Angibau & Mallin, Boscombe.
BENNETT, ABRAHAM LEVY, Boscombe. Mar. 31. D'Angibau & Mallin, Boscombe.
BENNE, WILLIAM MOORE, Oulton Cross Stone, Staffs. April 4. Bird & Bird, Gray's Inn-sq.
BOOTH, THOMAS, Manchester. April 5. Orford & Sons, Manchester.
CARSWELL, CHRISTOPHER HYLAND, Rhyl. April 30. Tucker, Tucker & Richardson, Manchester.
CATHERMOLLE, HENRY, Herne Hill, Stores Departmental Manager. April 15. Carter & Barber, Finsbury-sq., E.C.2.
CHARTER, ISAAC JOHN ROYLANDS, Exmouth. April 22. Timmins & Timmins, Bath.
CLERE, ALLAN HENRY, Clevedon. April 12. Rickerby & Co., Cheltenham.
COWEN, EDWARD INGHAM, Stockton-on-Tees. Mar. 24. Faber, Fawcett & Faber, Stockton-on-Tees.
CROCKETT, ANNIE ALLISON, Lewes. May 2. Lewis & Holman, Lewes.
DONALDSON, MARTHA, King's Lynn. April 14. Sadler & Woodwork, King's Lynn.
DUCK, MRS. MARTHA, York. April 23. A. E. Walker, York.
EAGLE, FRED, Rhy, Suffolk, Farmer. April 6. Banks Ashton & Co., Bury St. Edmunds.
ESCOMBE, GERTRUDE, Eastbourne. April 20. J. J. Williamson, Deal.
FRYER, SIR CHARLES EDWARD, Notting Hill. May 31. Percy Umney & Scorer, Richmond, Surrey.
GILBERT, DAVID, Barnsley, Farmer. April 1. Riddal & Son, Barnsley.
GILBERT, FREDERICK THOMAS, Llandaf North, Glam, Analytical Chemist. April 4. J. B. Stephens, Cardiff.
GOLDSMITH, HORTENSE, Ashton-on-Mersey. April 5. J. Andrew Orrell, Manchester.
GOTTWALT, ELIZABETH, Emperor's-gate, Middx. April 15. Macintosh, Thomas & Co., Cardiff.
GREGORY, DAVID, Tarporey, Cheshire, Labourer. April 10. Edward Cawley, Tarporey.
GRIFF, THOMAS HENRY, Kingsway, W.C.2, Architect. April 9. Tackley & Fall, Orchard-st., W.1.
GRIFFIN, THOMAS JOSEPH, Bishopston, Bristol. April 4. Wansbroughs, Robinson, Taylor & Taylor, Bristol.
HABIB, HALDECK, ANTON, Clapham. April 9. Kingsbury & Turner, Brixton-rd., S.W.9.
HALL, BERTHE, St. Raphael, Var, France. Mar. 28. Rider, Heaton, Meredith & Mills, New-sq., Lincoln's Inn.
HARDING, FREDERICK JAMES, Whitefield, Lancs. April 2. Orford & Sons, Manchester.
HARRIS, BENJAMIN FRED, Dunston-on-Tyne, Cook. April 4. H. & J. P. Watson, Middlesbrough.
HAWORTH, MARIA, Old Kent-rd. April 5. Radcliffes & Higginson, Blackburn.
HOLLEY, EMILY GEORGINA, Bath. Mar. 15. Fuller & Whittington, Bath.
HOLLIDAY, MARTHA TURNER, Batey. April 9. J. H. Wilman, Batey.
JAVIS, WILLIAM GEORGE, Clare, Suffolk, Builder. April 5. F. C. Wayman, Clare, Suffolk.
LACHLAN, HENRY, Peckham. April 30. Woodroffes, Eastcheap, E.C.3.
LAWSON, WILLIAM MALTYB, Beddingfield, nr. Eves, Suffolk. April 6. Banks, Ashton & Co., Bury St. Edmunds.
LEWIS, EMMA, Rattendon Common, Essex. April 1. Leonard Gray & Co., Chelmsford, Essex.
LEWIS, MARGARET MARY, Radyr, Glam. April 18. Grover, Smith & Moss, Manchester.
MACKENNIE, EUPHEMIA JONSON, Exmouth. April 15. H. C. Adams, Exmouth.
MARSHALL, THOMAS EDWARD, Salford, Ironfounders' Merchant. Mar. 21. Thomas Jones, Manchester; Field & Cunningham, Manchester.
MARSHALL, ELIZABETH ANN, Low Fell, Durham. April 8. Criddle & Ord, Gateshead.
MELVILLE, CATHERINE MARIA, Elburton, Devon. April 10. Greenway & Sons, Newquay.
MORRIS, JOHN GEORGE, Sunderland. April 11. Fred W. Service, Sunderland.
PARRY, NICHOLAS, Ore, nr. Hastings. April 14. J. Kennett Brown, St. Helens.
PIGO, THOMAS HENRY, Anstey, Herts, Farmer. April 10. Wortham & Co., Royston, Herts.

THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL.

WHEN CALLED UPON TO ADVISE AS TO LEGACIES, PLEASE DO NOT FORGET THE CLAIMS OF THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL, WHICH IS URGENTLY IN NEED OF FUNDS FOR ITS HUMANE WORK.

PHILLIPSON, THOMAS, Stamfordham, Veterinary Surgeon. April 11. Robert Brown & Son, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
PROSSER, JOHN BENNETT, Lincoln, Engineer. April 2. G. E. D. Padley, Lincoln.
RIST, WILHELM, Goppingsen, Germany. April 23. Kenneth, Brown, Baker, Baker, Norfolk-st., W.C.2.
BURY, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Bournemouth, Foreign Produce Merchant. May 1. J. M. Turner, Bournemouth.
RYAN, LAURA, Cannes, France. April 20. Bennett & Ferris, Coleman-st., E.C.2.
RYLAND, MATILDA, South Lowestoft. April 6. Hallett, Croery & Co., Ashford, Kent.
SCHEER, MRS. ELLEN, Green Street Green, Kent. Mar. 31. Martin & Son, Gravesend.
STOCKER, JANE, South Kensington. April 15. Child & Child, Sloane-st., S.W.1.
SWAIN, ELLEN, Tonbridge. April 11. A. H. Bailey & Co., Tonbridge, Kent.
TAYLOR, THOMAS, Horsmonden, Kent, Farmer. April 11. A. H. Bailey & Co., Tonbridge, Kent.
THOMPSON, ELLEN, Liverpool. April 1. William E. Gregson, Liverpool.
TIMMS, FREDERICK JOSEPH, Worthing. April 21. Verrall & Sons, Worthing, Sussex.
VALE, AMELIA, Hartlebury, Worcester. April 19. C. Hugh Watson, Stourport.
VALE, THOMAS, Hartlebury, Worcester, Contractor for Public Works. April 19. C. Hugh Watson, Stourport.
VOGT, MATHEW, Bloomsbury, Watchmaker. April 12. H. P. Russell, Bexley Heath.
WATSON, AGNES AMIE, Brandon, Suffolk. April 11. Odden F. Read, Mildenhall, Suffolk.
WILLIAMS, WILLIAM, Caerwys, Flint, Timber Merchant. Mar. 31. Aneurin O. Evans & Co., Denbigh.
WILSON, MARY, North Hykeham, Lincoln. April 2. G. E. B. Padley, Lincoln.
WISE, GEORGE, Wimbledon, Mercantile Clerk. Mar. 31. Cornells & Berney, Batham, S.W.12.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, MAR. 11.

ARDDOTT, THOMAS, Colwyn Bay. April 3. Edgar Hosking, Liverpool.
AYRE, ALGERNON SYDNEY, Hensle. April 21. Stamp, Jackson & Birks, Hull.
BAKER, WILLIAM, West Norwood. April 11. Tippetts, Malden-la., E.C.4.
BARNARD, THOMAS, Cleethorpes, General Dealer. April 12. John Barker, Great Grimsby.
BRODIE, JAMES, Hkley. April 4. Sinclair & Atkinson, Otley.
BROWN, JAMES WILLIAM, Sidcup, Kent, Civil Servant. April 18. Holdsworth & Co., Serjeants'-Inn, E.C.4.
BROWN, MARION EMMA, Billericay, Essex. April 11. R. C. Bartlett, Bedford-row, W.C.1.
BULL, HERBERT FRANCIS, Worthing. April 30. Thorowgood & Co., Copthall-st., E.C.2.
CADBY, JULIA NASH, Worthing. April 25. Hanbury, Whitting & Ingie, New Broad-st., E.C.2.
CAMPELL, EMMA ELIZABETH, Birkdale. April 9. J. Longland, Warrington.
CAMPELL, WILLIAM, Chichester. April 30. Lee & Pemberton, Lincoln's Inn-fields, W.C.
CAPOE, GEORGE GIBLING, Tostock, Landowner. April 9. W. W. Box & Co., Bedford-row, W.C.1.
CARTER, EDWIN, Kempsey. April 5. H. H. Foster, Malvern.
CLEBORN, JAMES, Cuddington, nr. Northwich, Ironfounder. May 1. A. & J. B. Fletcher, Northwich, Cheshire.
THOMPSON, REVEREND HENRY, Exmouth. April 1. Houlkitch, Amstey & Thompson, Southeyham, Exeter.
ECLES, WILLIAM HENRY, Skipton. April 16. Maguinness & Mande, Bradford.
FIDLER, BERTHAM HAY, South Australia, Farmer. April 18. Pearce & Nicholls, New-st., W.C.
FIRTH, MARY ANN, Kingston-upon-Hull. May 1. Middlemiss, Pearce & Miller, Hull.
FLETCHER, HENRY ARTHUR, Colwyn Bay, Ship Broker. April 12. Edward G. Twemlow, Manchester.
FRY, MARIABELLA, Failand, Somerset. April 20. Smiths, Fox & Sedgwick, Lincoln's Inn-fields, W.C.2.
GARRITT, MATILDA JANE, Banbury, Oxford. April 7. Fairfax & Barfield, Banbury.
GILL, JULIA GEORGINA FLORENCE, Malvern Wells, Worcester. April 12. Farrar & Co., Manchester.
GODFREY, WILLIAM JOSEPH, Portman-sq., W. April 4. Lee & Pemberton, Lincoln's Inn-fields, W.C.
GOLDSCHMIDT, SIMON HEINRICH, West Hampstead, Warehouseman. April 16. Baker & Nairne, Bishopsgate, E.C.3.
GRAHAM, SYBIL, Carlisle. April 7. Halton & Seal, Carlisle.
HALL, WILLIAM NICHOLSON, Calster, Lincoln. April 12. John Barker, Great Grimsby.
HAYNES, ALICE, Greenwich, Kent. April 14. R. S. Jackson & Bowles, Greenwich.
HERDMAN, MARY ALICE, Sloane-sq. April 8. Tippetts, Malden-la., E.C.4.
LA FONTAINE, JAMES STEPHEN EDWARD, Norwich. April 15. Mills & Reeve, Norwich.
JONES, RICHARD, Handsworth, Manufacturing Jeweller. April 9. R. L. Holt, Birmingham.
LAIDLAW, MISS AGNES ALICE, Bournemouth. April 8. Mooring, Aldridge & Haydon, Bournemouth.
LAWRENCE, JOHN WILLIAM BURTON, Northfield-rd. May 2. Tamplin, Taylor & Joseph, Fenchurch-st., E.C.3.
LEMON, PHILIP MONTAGUE, Dury St. Edmunds. Mar. 31. Mills & Reeve, Norwich.
LITTLE, ISABELLA, Allendale, Northumberland. April 8. Criddle & Ord, Gateshead.
LOTEN, FRUENDE, Cheshire, Staffs. April 7. Bagg, Son & Masfield, Cheshire, Staffs.
MALCOLM, JOHN, Edgbaston, Veterinary Surgeon. April 11. Glasyer, Porter & Mason, Birmingham.
MARTIN, ALBERT HENRY, Leeds. April 12. Wm. Roberts Wilson, Leeds.
MARTIN, ROBERT HOW, SIR WILLIAM, P.C., I.L.D., Bramshaw, Hants. Mar. 31. Warren, Murton, Miller & Foster, Bloomsbury-sq., W.C.1.
MILLIGAN, HORACE VAN, Constantinople, Turkey. April 18. Pearce & Nicholls, New-st., W.C.
MILFORD, HESTER, Dover. April 24. Lewis & Pain, Dover.
MORGAN, SARAH JANE, Forest Hill, Kent. April 15. Blossie R. Armstrong, Forest Hill, S.E.23.
MUNRO, WALTER ROSS, Camberwell, Telegraphist. April 23. Ody & Wilnot, Camberwell Green, S.E.5.
NAYLOR, CAROLINE, Grimsby. April 12. John Barker, Great Grimsby.
NORTLAND, GEORGE, Leamington. April 30. Wright, Hassall & Co., Leamington.
PELL, SARAH ANN, Malskstone. April 6. Winch, Greensted & Winch, Sittingbourne.
PITT, WALTER, Southstoke, nr. Bath. April 15. Stone, Thomas & King, Bath.
PRESTON, CHARLES SHIRLEY, New Brighton. April 11. Hannay, Horton & Cook, Liverpool.
RYCROFT, EVELYN GEORGE, Chipping Norton. April 30. Kendall, Price & Francis, Carey-st., W.C.2.
SCALES, JAMES ROBERT, Kingston-upon-Thames. April 4. Durham & Charlton, Kingston-upon-Thames.
SHEDDEN, EDITH ALICE, Preston, Lancs. April 9. Douglas Houston, Duchy of Lancaster Office, W.C.2.
SIMPSON, JAMES BARRON, St. Marylebone, Builder. April 12. Saxton & Morgan, Portman-sq., W.1.
STARMER, CHARLES, Aberley. April 7. Bridgman & Co., College-hill, E.C.4.
STEPHENSON, ROBERT, Great Grimsby. Mar. 31. C. R. Bradburne, Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, W.C.
STEPHENS, JAMES HORTON, Brighton. April 12. Nye & Cleeve, Brighton.
STEPHENS, BLANCHÉ EMILY, Hockley, Birmingham. April 9. Sydney Mitchell & Chattock, Birmingham.
STRADLING, FLORENCE THETIS, Lancaster. April 11. Whitaker, Hibbert & Evans, Haslingden, Lancs.
THERON, LUCAS CORNELIUS, South Africa. April 30. Bristows, Cooke & Carmichael, Copthall-bldgs., E.C.2.
TIDY, EMMA SARAH, Thames Ditton. April 11. Sharn, Roscoe, Massey & Co., Bedford-row, W.C.1.
TREMPER, JESSIE RETALLACK, Manhattan. April 11. R. C. Bartlett, Bedford-row, W.C.1.
TURNER, SAMUEL, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Surveyor. April 2. Fishers, Ashby-de-la-Zouch.
VAUSE, JAMES, Balby, nr. Doncaster. April 11. Geo. Crombie & Sons, Stonegate.

WATSON, WILLIAM ARTHUR, Erdington, Commercial Traveller. April 9. Thomas F. Walker, Birmingham.
 WATSON, ALBERT HENRY, Hampstead. April 11. Lamb, Son & France, King-st., E.C.2.
 WELLS, JOSEPH, Finsbury Park-rd. April 8. White & Co., Sackville-st., W.1.
 WEST, CHARLES SPEICER, Sydenham, Kent. April 15. Blome R. Armstrong & Co., Forest Hill, S.E.23.
 WEST, WILLIAM WALLACE, Fulham. April 14. Shatt, Roncoe, Maasey & Co., Bedford-row, W.C.1.
 WHITE, ISAAC, Smethwick. April 10. W. H. Stoddard, Birmingham.
 WHITMAN, MARY SHAW, Blackpool. April 14. Frupp & Son, Oldham.
 WHITE, RALPH, Gosforth. April 7. Gordon & Co., Piccadilly, W.1.
 WILKINSON, JOHN WILLIAM, Shelton-in-Cleveland. April 11. Buchanan, Richardson & Barugh, Galsborough.
 WILKINSON, ISAAC, Shelton-in-Cleveland. April 11. Buchanan, Richardson & Barugh, Galsborough.
 WINDLE, MARY JESSON, Clevedon. April 12. Marlow, Marten & Jenson, Walsall.
 WOODHALL, SAMUEL, Perry Barr, Staffs, Brewer. April 19. Caddick & Yates, West Bromwich.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Mar. 15.

BLACK, HENRY WEATHERSON, North Shields, Licensed Victualler. April 30. Reed, Ryder & Melkie, North Shields.
 BROWN, CHARLOTTE ANN, Oldham. April 11. Charles Clegg & Slater, Oldham.
 BROWN, ROBERT, Salford, Cattle Salesman. May 15. T. W. Markland & Whitehead, Manchester.
 CLEBOURN, EDGAR HENRY, Sutton, Surrey. April 15. Lamb, Son & France, Cheapside, E.C.2.
 COHN, ALBERT, Hampstead, Merchant. April 19. Bruce, Millar & Co., Basinghall-st., E.C.2.
 COURTNEY, MARGARET, Cliftonville, Margate. April 30. H. S. Chamberlain, Bognor.
 COWLEY, FREDERICK HAMILTON, Ventnor, I. of W. April 26. Trinder, Capron & Co., Lendenhall-st., E.C.3.
 DAVIS, LEWIS, King's Bench-walk, Temple, Solicitor. April 23. Peacock & Goldard, South-eq., Gray's Inn, W.C.1.
 DAVIS, JOHN HENRY, Dover. April 11. Bradley, Chitty & Scorer, Dover.
 DONALDSON, JAMES, Ventnor, I. of W. April 16. H. C. Raby, Ventnor, I. of W.
 EYARS, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Beer House Keeper. April 9. Rankin & Miller, West Bromwich.
 FRENCH, PERCY, Bushey, Herts. April 30. Windybank, Samuel & Lawrence, St. Swithin's-ls., E.C.4.
 GAGE, JAMES, Southampton. April 11. Tyrer, Kenion & Co., Liverpool.
 GREEN, JAMES, Ogbourne St. George, Wilts, Licensed Victualler. April 28. A. Richard Palm, Marlborough, Wilts.
 HAWCROFT, ANN, Sheffield. April 12. Broomhead, Wightman & Reed, Sheffield.
 HENRIOT, ROBERT, Old Broad-st. April 15. P. Marr Johnson, Drapers-gdns., E.C.2.

HINCHLIFFE, WALTER PRINCE, Salford, Buyer. April 23. Boote, Edgar & Co., Manchester.
 HOLT, RICHARD ARTHUR, Liverpool. April 2. Edward Lloyd, Liverpool.
 HOPKINS, WILLIAM RANDOLPH INNES, Malton. April 19. Trotter, Bruce & Loft, Bishop Auckland.
 HOWWOOD, MARTHA, Trydodyn, Mold, Flint. April 25. Walker, Smith & Way, Chester.
 HOWARD, MRS. ANN, Sheffield. April 30. Bagshaw & Co., Sheffield.
 JOHNSON, HUTCHINSON, Sunderland, Ship Stores Dealer. April 23. William Bell & Sons, Sunderland.
 KNATCHBULL, COLONEL FRANCIS, Bath. April 15. Mercer, Baker & Bowen, Canterbury, Kent.
 PARKES, GEORGE EDWARD, Lomington. April 14. Sydney Mitchell & Chattock, Birmingham.
 PECTIVAL, REVEREND CHARLES JAMES, Corwen, Merioneth. April 15. Bridges, Sawtell & Co., Red Lion-sq., W.C.1.
 PETRI, FRIEDRICH AUGUST, South Kensington. April 11. Finch, Turner & Taylor, Cannon-st.
 PHILP, ANNE CROMBIE, Earl's Court. April 12. Ford, Lloyd, Bartlett & Michelmore, Bloomsbury-sq., W.C.1.
 PILE, THOMAS, Camberwell. April 23. A. Armstrong, Mostyn-rd., Brixton, S.W.9.
 PRICE, JAMES, Press, Salop. April 30. A. E. Whittingham, Nantwich.
 REICHERT, FRANCIS XAVIER, Heaton Norris, Lancs. April 12. Shippey, Earley & Doherty, Manchester.
 ROBERTS, SARAH ANN, Clotton Hoofield, Chester. May 3. James C. Bate, Chester.
 ROBINSON, CHARLOTTE, Kingston-upon-Hull. April 12. John S. Saxelby, Hull.
 SALDREO, GABRIEL, Hampstead. April 30. Windybank, Samuel & Lawrence, St. Swithin's-ls., E.C.4.
 SLADEN, MRS. ANNE, Rhayader, Radnorshire. April 15. St. Barbe Sladen & Wing, Queen Anne's-gate, S.W.1.
 SLIGO, THOMAS HENRY, Staveley, Derby, Farmer. April 26. Watson, Esam & Barber, Sheffield.
 SMITHIES, CAROLINE EMMA, Manchester. April 16. Heath, Sons, Sutton & Broome, Manchester.
 SMITH, HERBERT FORD, Stretford, Manchester. April 25. Sale & Co., Manchester.
 SPICER, JANE ANN, Eltham, Kent. April 16. Freshfields & Leese, Old Jewry, E.C.2.
 STEPHENSON, ADELA LOUISE, Brighton. April 9. H. Montague Williams, Louthbury, E.C.3.
 STUBBS, HOWARD OVERING, Windsor. April 18. Williams & James, Norfolk House, Thames Embankment, W.C.2.
 SUMNER, JOHN, Ormskirk, Registrar. April 1. Dickinson & Watson, Ormskirk.
 THOMAS, ROSE AMY, Chiswick. April 30. G. H. Monson, Chiswick-ls., W.C.2.
 TROTTER, ADELA MARIA, Folkestone. May 1. Trotter, Goodhall & Patteson, Victoria-st., S.W.1.
 TURNBULL, WILLIAM JAMES, Loughborough. April 20. J. H. Joynson, Liverpool.
 WALLINGTON, EMMA SUSANNAH SOPHIA, Fulham. May 10. Sydney James, Carey-st., W.C.2.
 WILSON, GEORGE, Hollinwood, Lancs., Joiner. April 15. G. F. Tanner, Oldham.
 WOOLAND, MARY ADA, Chiswick. April 20. N. Ramsey Murray, Chiswick, W.4.

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Mar. 8.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

AISTHORPE, WILLIAM, Great Grimsby, Bricklayer. Great Grimsby. Pet. Mar. 3. Ord. Mar. 3.
 BAINES, JAMES, Barnsley, Fancy Goods Dealer. Barnsley. Pet. Feb. 19. Ord. Mar. 4.
 BERENBAUM, LOUIS, Higher Broughton, Salford, Clothier. Salford. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 BLACKBURN, ARTHUR OWEN, Ormskirk, High Court. Pet. Jan. 3. Ord. Mar. 3.
 BURKITT, RALPH, Kingston-upon-Hull, Tailor. Kingston-upon-Hull. Pet. Mar. 2. Ord. Mar. 2.
 CHATWIN, HERBERT HENRY, Lichfield, COLEMAN, ERNEST, Sutton Coldfield, Chased Pattern Makers. Birmingham. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 CLAYTON, SYDNEY GEORGE, Greenwich, Wholesale Perfumer. Greenwich. Pet. Mar. 3. Ord. Mar. 3.
 COLEMAN, TOM, Kettering, Shoe Manufacturer. Northampton. Pet. Mar. 5. Ord. Mar. 5.
 COLLINGS, LEWIS HERBERT, Biggleswade, Farmer. Bedford. Pet. Feb. 18. Ord. Mar. 4.
 FELL, HENRY, New Wortley, Leeds, Journeyman Joiner. Leeds. Pet. Mar. 2. Ord. Mar. 2.
 FENNELL, RICHARD HOLDSWORTH, Sandal, Wakefield, Spirit Merchant. Wakefield. Pet. Mar. 3. Ord. Mar. 3.
 GOODINGS, ERNEST ALBERT, Reading, Berks, Electrical Engineer. Reading. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 GUISSE & MILLER, Manchester, Rainproof Manufacturers. Manchester. Pet. Feb. 11. Ord. Mar. 4.
 KESLEY, MAYOR HENRY, Cavendish-sq., W. High Court. Pet. Oct. 11. Ord. Mar. 2.
 LEFFEL, SIMON, Dalston, Furrier. High Court. Pet. Jan. 27. Ord. Mar. 2.
 LEWIS, HENRY AUSTIN, Merthyr Tydfil, Outfitter. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 MAYER, JAMES THOMAS, Heywood, Cycle Repairer. Bolton. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 MCCULLOCH, WILLIAM LEITCH, Rottingdean, Sussex. Brighton. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 MCNAUGHT, CHARLES JOHN, Shepherd's Bush, Director. High Court. Pet. Jan. 18. Ord. Mar. 2.
 PATON, JOHN STAFFORD, Bayswater, Clerk. High Court. Pet. Jan. 6. Ord. Mar. 3.
 PAYNE, HERBERT AINSLEY, Bishopsgate, Timber Agent. High Court. Pet. Dec. 17. Ord. Mar. 3.
 PENBERTON, HENRY, Sutton-on-Sea, Lincoln, Tailor. Boston. Pet. Mar. 5. Ord. Mar. 5.
 RANDALL, E. J., Moor-la, Pyjama Manufacturers. High Court. Pet. Feb. 7. Ord. Mar. 3.
 READ, ISAAC, Newell Hill, Contractor. High Court. Pet. Mar. 5. Ord. Mar. 5.
 SMITH, PERCY, Sheffield, General Labourer. Sheffield. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 TAYLOR, ARTHUR ETHELRED, Wakefield, Taxi-cab Proprietor. Wakefield. Pet. Mar. 3. Ord. Mar. 3.
 TOHERNINE, DIMITRI, 302, Strand, High Court. Pet. Jan. 21. Ord. Mar. 3.
 TROOD, WILLIAM TUNSTALL, Ipswich, Grocer. Ipswich. Pet. Mar. 3. Ord. Mar. 3.
 VAN DEN HURK, Crutched-frams, Merchant. High Court. Pet. Feb. 7. Ord. Mar. 3.
 VASHER, GEORGE CHARLES, Fenchurch-st. High Court. Pet. Jan. 22. Ord. Mar. 3.
 WINE, ERNEST BURTON, Broad Street-pl., E.C. High Court. Pet. Dec. 18. Ord. Mar. 3.
 WISKEMANN, H., Basinghall-st., E.C.3, Merchant. High Court. Pet. Jan. 8. Ord. Mar. 3.

FIRST MEETINGS.

AISTHORPE, WILLIAM, Great Grimsby, Bricklayer. Great Grimsby. Mar. 16 at 11. Off. Rec., St. Mary's-church, Great Grimsby.
 BLACKBURN, ARTHUR OWEN, Ormskirk, High Court. Mar. 16 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
 BLEWETT, CHARLES KEAN, Redruth, Cornwall, Baker. Truro. Mar. 18 at 12. Off. Rec., 12, Princes-st., Truro.
 BURKITT, RALPH, Kingston-upon-Hull, Tailor. Kingston-upon-Hull. Mar. 17 at 11.30. Off. Rec., York City Bank-chmbrs., Lowgate, Hull.
 CAIRNS, E. D., Berryborough, Barnstaple. Mar. 21 at 12. Royal Clarence Hotel, Ilfracombe.
 CARLESS, REGINALD WALLACE, Stafford, Veterinary Surgeon. Stafford. Mar. 17 at 11. Vine Hotel, Stafford.
 CLAYTON, SYDNEY GEORGE, Greenwich, Wholesale Perfumer. Greenwich. Mar. 16 at 11.30. York-rd., Westminster Bridge-rd., S.E.1.
 COOK, FRED, Cwmcaru, nr. Newport, Mon. Shoe Dealer. Newport. Mar. 16 at 11.45. County Court Offices. Dock-st., Newport, Mon.
 FENNELL, RICHARD HOLDSWORTH, Sandal, Wakefield, Spirit Merchant. Wakefield. Mar. 17 at 11.30. Off. Rec., 21, King-st., Wakefield.
 HALL, SIDNEY ALEXANDER, Hindon, Wilts, Smallholder. Salisbury. Mar. 15 at 11. Off. Rec., City-chmbrs., Salisbury.
 HERRING, WILLIAM RICHARD, Crews, Upholsterer. Nantwich. Mar. 16 at 11.15. North Stafford Hotel, Stoke-upon-Trent.
 HOLLES, ARNOLD, Todmorden, Furniture Dealer. Burnley. Mar. 18 at 11. Off. Rec., Byrom-st., Manchester.
 HOPPER, ALFRED ERNEST, Barnstaple, Solicitor. Barnstaple. Mar. 19 at 11. Bridge Hall, Barnstaple.
 JONES, WILLIAM HERBERT, Walton, Liverpool, Certified Accountant. Liverpool. Mar. 15 at 11.30. Off. Rec., Union Marine-bldgs., 11, Dale-st., Liverpool.
 JOHNSON, HARRY, Brampton, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Lincoln. Mar. 16 at 11.30. Off. Rec., Bank-st., Lincoln.
 KESLEY, MAYOR HENRY, Cavendish-sq., W. High Court. Mar. 16 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
 LEFFEL, SIMON, Dalston, Furrier. High Court. Mar. 16 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
 MAIR, WILLIAM GUARDHOUSE, Burnley, Draper. Burnley. Mar. 16 at 11. Off. Rec., 13, Winckley-st., Preston.
 MCNAUGHT, CHARLES JOHN, Shepherd's Bush, High Court. Mar. 17 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
 NASH, WILLIAM HERBERT, Salisbury, Motor Agent. Salisbury. Mar. 15 at 11.30. Off. Rec., City-chmbrs., Catherine-st., Salisbury.
 PATON, JOHN STAFFORD, Bayswater, Clerk. High Court. Mar. 17 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
 PAYNE, HERBERT AINSLEY, Bishopsgate, Timber Agent. High Court. Mar. 16 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
 PORTER, JOHN ARTHUR, Andover, Hardware Merchant. Salisbury. Mar. 15 at 3. Off. Rec., City-chmbrs., Catherine-st., Salisbury.
 RANDALL, E. J., Moor-la, Pyjama Manufacturers. High Court. Mar. 16 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
 TAYLOR, ARTHUR ETHELRED, Wakefield, Taxi-Cab Proprietor. Wakefield. Mar. 17 at 11. Off. Rec., 21, King-st., Wakefield.
 TOHERNINE, DIMITRI, 302, Strand, High Court. Mar. 18 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
 VAN DEN HURK, Crutched-frams, Merchant. High Court. Mar. 16 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.

VASHER, GEORGE CHARLES, Fenchurch-st. High Court. Mar. 16 at 12.30. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
 WILLIAMS, JACK, Neath, Glam., Fruiterer. Neath. Mar. 17 at 11. Off. Rec., Government-bldgs., St. Mary's-st., Swansea.
 WINE, ERNEST BURTON, Broad Street-pl., E.C. High Court. Mar. 18 at 12.30. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
 WISKEMANN, H., Basinghall-st., E.C.3, Merchant. High Court. Mar. 17 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.

ADJUDICATIONS.

AISTHORPE, WILLIAM, Great Grimsby, Bricklayer. Great Grimsby. Pet. Mar. 3. Ord. Mar. 3.
 BERENBAUM, LOUIS, Broughton, Salford, Clothier. Salford. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 BURKITT, RALPH, Kingston-upon-Hull, Tailor. Kingston-upon-Hull. Pet. Mar. 2. Ord. Mar. 2.
 BURTON, JOHN READ, Highgate-rd. High Court. Pet. Jan. 11. Ord. Mar. 3.
 CHATWIN, HERBERT HENRY, Little Hay, Lichfield, and COLEMAN, ERNEST, Sutton Coldfield, Chased Pattern Makers. Birmingham. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 CLAYTON, SYDNEY GEORGE, Greenwich, Retail Perfumer. Greenwich. Pet. Mar. 3. Ord. Mar. 3.
 COLEMAN, TOM, Kettering, Shoe Manufacturer. Northampton. Pet. Mar. 5. Ord. Mar. 5.
 COLLINGS, ARTHUR EDWARD, Dorset-sq. High Court. Pet. May 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 DALE, FRANK, Canterbury-rd., Chocolate Manufacturers. High Court. Pet. Oct. 14. Ord. Mar. 1.
 DE BEIR, CHARLES ANGELO EDWARD, Loughborough, Leicester. Pet. Jan. 5. Ord. Mar. 3.
 FELL, HENRY, New Wortley, Leeds, with HAROLD SIMPSON, Garforth, Joiners. Leeds. Pet. Mar. 2. Ord. Mar. 2.
 GOODINGS, ERNEST ALBERT, Reading, Berks, Electrical Engineer. Reading. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 HAYES, CHARLES FRANCIS, Bristol, Tailor. Bristol. Pet. Feb. 1. Ord. Mar. 3.
 JOHNSON, HARRY, Brampton, Farmer. Lincoln. Pet. Feb. 21. Ord. Mar. 2.
 KENT, WILLIAM GEORGE, Walton, Suffolk, Butcher. Ipswich. Pet. Nov. 2. Ord. Mar. 2.
 LEWIS, HENRY AUSTIN, Merthyr Tydfil, Outfitter. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 MAYER, JAMES THOMAS, Heywood, Cycle Repairer. Bolton. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 MILLS, EDWARD, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Watchmaker. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. Feb. 8. Ord. Mar. 3.
 MCNAUGHT, CHARLES JOHN, Shepherd's Bush. High Court. Pet. Jan. 18. Ord. Mar. 4.
 PEERS, BASIL, East Grinstead, Estate Agent. High Court. Pet. Nov. 29. Ord. Mar. 3.
 PENBERTON, HENRY, Sutton-on-Sea, Lincoln, Tailor. Boston. Pet. Mar. 5. Ord. Mar. 5.
 PIERCE, BERNARD MYER, Spitalfields, Ladies' Hat Manufacturer. High Court. Pet. Jan. 22. Ord. Mar. 2.
 READ, ISAAC, Newell Hill, Contractor. High Court. Pet. Mar. 5. Ord. Mar. 5.
 RUSSEL, JOHN WOOL, Southport, Motor Dealer. Liverpool. Pet. Jan. 13. Ord. Mar. 3.
 SHEPPARD, WILLIAM HERBERT, Teddington, Commercial Traveller. Kingston. Pet. Oct. 7. Ord. Mar. 5.
 SMITH, PERCY, Sheffield, Tobacconist. Sheffield. Pet. Mar. 4. Ord. Mar. 4.
 TAYLOR, ARTHUR ETHELRED, Wakefield, Taxi-Cab Proprietor. Wakefield. Pet. Mar. 3. Ord. Mar. 3.
 TOMLIN, ALICE, Wellesloe-sq. High Court. Pet. Jan. 13. Ord. Mar. 3.
 TOMLIN, STANLEY, Wellesloe-sq. High Court. Pet. Jan. 13. Ord. Mar. 3.

VINE, JOSEPH, Harrow-rd., Manufacturer. High Court. Pet. Mar. 1. Ord. Mar. 2.
WALKER, HENRY, Ilfracombe, Tobacco Dealer. Barnstaple. Pet. Feb. 2. Ord. Mar. 3.
WEINBAUM, WILLIAM, Mile End, and ROSENBERG, BARNETT, Walthamstow, Manufacturers. High Court. Pet. Jan. 19. Ord. Mar. 2.
WORTLEY, GLENN, Rotherham, Joiner. Sheffield. Pet. Mar. 3. Ord. Mar. 3.

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the *London Gazette* of Dec. 24.

TOTTS, INDORE, South Hackney, Toy Manufacturer. High Court. Pet. Nov. 1. Ord. Dec. 22.

Amended Notice substituted for that published in the *London Gazette* of Feb. 25.

BAGSHAW, THOMAS FRANCIS, Sheffield, Stockbroker. Sheffield. Pet. Feb. 22. Ord. Feb. 22.

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

ABBOTT, LIEUT. FRANCIS GEORGE WHITE, Oxford-ter., Ex-Army Officer. High Court. Adjud. Nov. 28. Annul. Mar. 4.

London Gazette—FRIDAY, Mar. 11.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ABELL, THOMAS SPENCER HALL, Yelverton, South Devon, Turo. Pet. Feb. 16. Ord. Mar. 7.
ADAMS, BENJAMIN FERDINAND, Brentwood, Essex, Farmer. Chelmsford. Pet. Feb. 9. Ord. Mar. 7.
APPELCK, WILLIAM, Hexham, Estate Agent. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. Feb. 17. Ord. Mar. 8.
ARON, SOLOMON, Southampton, Upholsterer. Southampton. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
BERNSTEIN, H., Spitalfields, Furrier. High Court. Pet. Feb. 3. Ord. Mar. 8.
BRADFORD, ROBERT, East Boldon, Durham, Manufacturer of Foodstuffs. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. Mar. 5. Ord. Mar. 6.
BROOKE, FRANK CYRIL, Bingley, Paper Merchant. Leeds. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
BULLOCK, HERBERT CHARLES STUART, Boscombe, Bournemouth, Bullock, HAROLD GEORGE VICTOR, and BULLOCK, HOWARD WILLIAM, Motor Engineers. Poole. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
CARTER, CLARA MARIA, Birmingham, Fancy Goods Dealer. Birmingham. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
CASS, AMOS, and CASS, FRANK, Broughton, Farmers. Scarborough. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
CHAPLIN, FLORENCE MARY, Bedford Park, Baker. Brentford. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
CHAPLIN, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Bedford Park, Baker's Manager. Brentford. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
DEXTER, AMBROSE, Levenshulme, Packing Case Dealer. Manchester. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
EDMAN, E. C. BARING, India. High Court. Pet. Jan. 10. Ord. Mar. 8.
EDWARDS, JONATHAN EWART, Withington, Foreman Wire Drawer. Manchester. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
FITCH & SONS, Enfield. Edmonton. Pet. Feb. 18. Ord. Mar. 9.
GORMAN, ALFRED, Wolverhampton, and GREEN, CHARLES HAROLD, Birmingham, General Wood Workers. Wolverhampton. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
HALLETT, ALBERT JAMES, Porth, Giam, General Dealer. Pontypridd. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
HARDIMAN, JOSEPH, Cleethorpes, Joiner. Great Grimsby. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
HARROP, JAMES, Derby, Grocer. Ashton-under-Lyne. Pet. Mar. 5. Ord. Mar. 5.
HOBDEY, THOMAS GEORGE MEAKIN, Junr., Manchester, Commercial Traveller. Salford. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
HOWE, JAMES WALTER, Halifax, Commercial Traveller. Halifax. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
JACOBS, PHILIP, Birmingham, Clothier. Birmingham. Pet. Feb. 19. Ord. Mar. 7.
JOSEPH, L., Stamford-hill, N.16, Fancy Goods Manufacturer. High Court. Pet. Feb. 15. Ord. Mar. 9.
KITCHER, WILLIAM HENRY, Cardiff, Upholsterer. Cardiff. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
LOW, JOHN, Ferndown, Dorset. Poole. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
LUNDY, MARTIN, Bolton, Marine Store Dealer. Bolton. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
MONK, JAMES, Lincolnshire. Peterborough. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
MOUNTAIN, GEORGE, Ecclehill, Wholesale Confectioner. Bradford. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.

NEWELL, GEORGE ERNEST, Coventry, Master Tailor. Coventry. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
PARRY, THOMAS, Llanbadach, Glam, Grocer. Pontypridd. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
PENBRIDGE, ROBERT CECIL, Hereford. Hereford. Pet. Feb. 15. Ord. Mar. 8.
SHEPHERD, WALTER GEORGE, Carcroft, Yorks, Joiner. Sheffield. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
SHURE, J., Stoke Newington, N. Edmonton. Pet. Dec. 13. Ord. Mar. 9.
SLADE, JOHN, Stalybridge, and WALKER, JOHN ALFRED RANDOLPH, Urmston, Fancy Articles. Ashton-under-Lyne. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
THOMPSON, PETERUS PERCY CORNELIUS, Saint Peter's, Broadstairs, Mechanical Engineer. Canterbury. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
TIMMS, WALTER EDWARD, Fulbeck, Lincolnshire, Licensed Victualler. Nottingham. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
VARTY, ISAAC, Cumberland, Stone Mason. Carlisle. Pet. Feb. 22. Ord. Mar. 9.
WHITTS, JESSIE ADELAIDE, Puckeridge, Herts, Grocer. Hertford. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
WILBY, ARTHUR, Norwich, Fruit Dealer. Norwich. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.

FIRST MEETINGS.

BARLAND, HERBERT, Shipley, Yorks, Horticulturist. Bradford. Mar. 18 at 11. Off. Rec., 12 Duke-st., Bradford.
BAINES, JAMES, Barneley, Fancy Goods Dealer. Barneley. Mar. 21 at 10.30. Off. Rec., County Court Hall, Regent-st., Barneley.
BERNSTEIN, H., Spitalfields, Furrier. High Court. Mar. 22 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
BRADFORD, ROBERT, Durham, Manufacturer of Foodstuffs. Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Mar. 23 at 11. Off. Rec., Pearl-bldgs., Northumberland-st., Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
BURN, HARRY HUNTER, Southampton, Fruit Farmer. Winchester. Mar. 21 at 2.30. Off. Rec., Midland Bank-chambers, High-st., Southampton.
COWAN, MORRIS, West Hartlepool, Auctioneer. Sunderland. Mar. 22 at 2.30. Off. Rec., Manor-pl., Sunderland.
DURBAN, E. C. BARING, India. High Court. Mar. 22 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
EDWARDS, OWEN RANDOLPH, Hay, Brecon, Bootmaker. Hereford. Mar. 19 at 12. Off-st., Hereford.
FELL, HENRY, Leeds, Journeyman Joiner. Leeds. Mar. 12 at 11. Off. Rec., Bond-st., Leeds.
HARLEY, HENRY, Dudley, Licensed Victualler. Dudley. Mar. 21 at 12. Off. Rec., 1 Priory-st., Dudley.
JOSEPH, L., Stamford Hill, N.16, Fancy Goods Manufacturer. High Court. Mar. 21 at 12. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
KENT, FRANCIS CECIL, Nottingham, Motor Engineer. Nottingham. Mar. 21 at 12. Off. Rec., 4, Castle-pl., Nottingham.
NEWELL, GEORGE ERNEST, Coventry, Master Tailor. Coventry. Mar. 22 at 12. Off. Rec., The Barracks, Smith-st., Coventry.
OWEN, THOMAS HENRY CHAKE, Penarth, Glam, Stockbroker. Cardiff. Mar. 18 at 2.30. Off. Rec., St. Mary-st., Cardiff.
READ, ISABEL, Muswell Hill, Builder. High Court. Mar. 21 at 11. Bankruptcy-bldgs., Carey-st., W.C.2.
ROUSE, WILLIAM RICHARD, Tarrington, Baker. Hereford. Mar. 19 at 12. Off-st., Hereford.
SMITH, PERCY, Sheffield, General Labourer. Sheffield. Mar. 18 at 12. Off. Rec., Figtroo-is., Sheffield.
TIMMS, WALTER EDWARD, Lincolnshire, Licensed Victualler. Nottingham. Mar. 18 at 12. Off. Rec., Castle-pl., Nottingham.
TRODD, WILLIAM TUNSTALL, Ipswich, Grocer. Ipswich. Mar. 22 at 11. Off. Rec., Princes-st., Ipswich.
WOODWARD, CHARLES HENRY, Eccles, Jeweller. Salford. Mar. 18 at 3. Off. Rec., Byrom-st., Manchester.
WORRALL, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Tonbury, Walls, Baker. Kidderminster. Mar. 22 at 2. Lion Hotel, Kidderminster.
WORTLEY, GLENN, Rotherham, Joiner. Sheffield. Mar. 18 at 12.30. Off. Rec., Figtroo-is., Sheffield.

ADJUDICATIONS.

BAINES, JAMES, Barneley, Fancy Goods Dealer. Barneley. Pet. Mar. 19. Ord. Mar. 9.
BROOKE, FRANK CYRIL, Bingley, Paper Merchant. Leeds. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
CARLESS, ROGNALD WALLORS, Eastgate, Stafford, Veterinary Surgeon. Stafford. Pet. Jan. 28. Ord. Mar. 8.
CARTER, CLARA MARIA, Birmingham, Fancy Goods Dealer. Birmingham. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
CASS, AMOS, and CASS, FRANK, Broughton, Farmers. Scarborough. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.

CHAPLIN, FLORENCE MARY, Bedford Park, Baker. Brentford. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
CHAPLIN, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Bedford Park, Baker's Manager. Brentford. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
COHEN, T. M., Buckingham-gate, Manufacturers' Agent. High Court. Pet. Jan. 18. Ord. Mar. 8.
COWAN, MORRIS, West Hartlepool, Auctioneer. Sunderland. Pet. Feb. 1. Ord. Mar. 7.
DEXTER, AMBROSE, Levenshulme, Packing Case Dealer. Manchester. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
DE HELOS, LOUIS, Clapham-rd. High Court. Pet. Jan. 20. Ord. Mar. 7.
EDWARDS, SIR JOHN HENRY, Victoria-st. High Court. Pet. Jan. 11. Ord. Mar. 8.
EDWARDS, JONATHAN EWART, Withington, Foreman Wire Drawer. Manchester. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
GAYLOR, JOHN HENRY, Tufnell Park, Turf Commission Agent. High Court. Pet. Jan. 20. Ord. Mar. 5.
GORMAN, ALFRED, Wolverhampton, and GREEN, CHARLES HAROLD, Small Heath, General Wood Workers. Wolverhampton. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
GUILD, J. R. E., Henrietta-st., W.C. High Court. Pet. Oct. 2. Ord. Mar. 9.
HALLETT, ALBERT JAMES, Cymmer, Porth, Giam, General Dealer. Pontypridd. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
HARDIMAN, JOSEPH, Cleethorpes, Joiner. Great Grimsby. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
HARROP, JAMES, Hadfield, Derby, Grocer. Ashton-under-Lyne. Pet. Mar. 5. Ord. Mar. 5.
HENRICK, MICHAEL, Birmingham, Metal Merchant. Birmingham. Pet. Jan. 26. Ord. Mar. 9.
HOBDEY, THOMAS GEORGE MEAKIN, Manchester, Commercial Traveller. Salford. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
HOLROYD, JACKSON, Staincliffe, Halifax, Engineer. Halifax. Pet. Feb. 14. Ord. Mar. 8.
HOWE, JAMES WALTER, Halifax, Commercial Traveller. Halifax. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
KITCHER, WILLIAM HENRY, Cardiff, Upholsterer. Cardiff. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
LAVIS, WILLIAM, Peckham, Butcher. High Court. Pet. Jan. 15. Ord. Mar. 9.
LUNDY, MARTIN, Bolton, Marine Store Dealer. Bolton. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
MCGILL, GEORGE CHARLES FICOTT, Pall Mall. High Court. Pet. Oct. 29. Ord. Mar. 9.
MITCHELL, DAVID, Lower Clapton, Insurance Agent. High Court. Pet. Jan. 3. Ord. Mar. 9.
MONK, JESSE, Market Deeping. Peterborough. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
MOUNTAIN, GEORGE, Bradford, Wholesale Confectioner. Bradford. Pet. Mar. 9. Ord. Mar. 9.
NEWELL, GEORGE ERNEST, Coventry, Master Tailor. Coventry. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
PARRY, THOMAS, Llanbadach, Grocer. Pontypridd. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
PATON, JOHN STAFFORD, Baywater, Clerk. High Court. Pet. Jan. 6. Ord. Mar. 5.
POWELL, DAVID JAMES, Grosmont, Mon, Farmer. Hereford. Pet. Feb. 1. Ord. Mar. 7.
RANDALL, ERNEST JOHN, Moor-la, Pyjama Manufacturer. High Court. Pet. Feb. 7. Ord. Mar. 5.
SHEPHERD, WALTER GEORGE, Carcroft, Yorks, Baker. Sheffield. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
THOMPSON, PETERUS PERCY CORNELIUS, Broadstairs, Mechanical Engineer. Canterbury. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.
TIMMS, WALTER EDWARD, Fulbeck, Licensed Victualler. Nottingham. Pet. Mar. 8. Ord. Mar. 8.
TRODD, WILLIAM TUNSTALL, Ipswich, Grocer. Ipswich. Pet. Mar. 3. Ord. Mar. 8.
VAN DEN HURE, ADRIANUS HENDRIKUS, Crutched-friars, Merchant. High Court. Pet. Feb. 7. Ord. Mar. 5.
VARMER, GEORGE CHARLES, Fenchurch-st. High Court. Pet. Jan. 22. Ord. Mar. 8.
WILBY, ARTHUR, Norwich, Fruit Dealer. Norwich. Pet. Mar. 7. Ord. Mar. 7.

£5 TO £5,000 ADVANCED

on simple Promissory Notes. No bills of sale taken, and strictest privacy guaranteed. First letters of application receive prompt attention, and transactions carried out without delay. Terms mutually arranged to suit borrowers' convenience. Special quotations for short periods. Apply in confidence to:-

Advances 9, 10 Corridor Chambers
LEICESTER.

THE LICENSES AND GENERAL INSURANCE CO., LTD.,

CONDUCTING THE INSURANCE POOL for selected risks,

FIRE, BURGLARY, LOSS OF PROFIT, EMPLOYERS' FIDELITY, GLASS

MOTOR, PUBLIC LIABILITY, ETC., ETC.

Non-Mutual except in respect of **PROFITS** which are distributed annually to the Policy Holders.

THE POOL COMPREHENSIVE FAMILY POLICY at 4/6 per cent. is the most complete policy ever offered to householders.

THE POOL COMPREHENSIVE SHOPKEEPERS' POLICY Covers all Risks under One Document for One Inclusive Premium

LICENSE INSURANCE.

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

Suitable Clauses for Insertion in Leases and Mortgages of Licensed Property settled by Counsel will be sent on application.

For Further Information write: **VICTORIA EMBANKMENT** (next Temple Station), W.C.2.

